

\$1 million annually until the level of \$10 million is reached. The ceiling of \$10 million will remain thereafter. S. 22 passed Senate March 25. (Presidential recommendation.)

Yakima project, Washington: Authorizes \$5.1 million for the extension, construction and operation of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project with an irrigation potential of 7,000 additional acres (present irrigated acreage is 19,000). All but approximately \$135,000 is reimbursable. S. 794 passed Senate February 10.

TAXES

Motor Fuels Taxation Compact: Grants the consent of Congress to any of the several States and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proportion and reciprocity. S. 807 passed Senate March 15.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday, next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES; FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS; AND FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following today's session, until April 1, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WHAT IS THE U.S. ROLE IN EAST ASIA?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an extremely knowledgeable and valuable article entitled: "What Is Our Role in East Asia?" written by Denna F. Fleming, emeritus professor of International Relations at Vanderbilt University, appears in the March issue of the Western Political Quarterly.

Professor Fleming's qualifications are obvious from his autobiographical sketch from the latest edition of "Who's Who," which I ask to be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of his article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

No. 56—4

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I recommend this earnestly to all my colleagues both in the Senate and House, and urge them, whatever may have been their commitments under the pressure of events, to reappraise the whole situation in southeast Asia. We may not agree with every detail of Professor Fleming's scholarly presentation, but his general conclusions seem to me to be unanswerable, namely that we need an entirely new approach and that only disaster perhaps on a cosmic scale lies ahead, if the United States does not change its position and policy, and does it promptly. The war is escalating steadily, as could be foretold when President Johnson followed his mistaken advisers' counsels.

It is clear, of course, that when this article was written and printed it was just before the United States' bombing of North Vietnam, but that merely emphasizes the validity of Professor Fleming's contentions.

I also ask unanimous consent that a very pertinent letter to President Johnson, summarizing the extent of our folly, written by Florence Luscomb, of which she sent me a copy, be likewise printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

Fleming, Denna Frank, teacher; born Paris, Ill., March 25, 1893; son Albert and Eleanor (McCormick) F.; graduate East Illinois State College 1912, Pd. D., 1949; A.B. University of Illinois 1916, A.M., 1920, Ph. D., 1928; student Columbia, 1928; married Doris Sigrid Anundsen, June 29, 1929. Principal high school, Hume, Ill., 1912-14, teacher high school, Freeport, 1916-17, Walla Walla, Wash., 1917; principal high school, Tonica, Ill., 1919-21, and Colfax, 1921-22; assistant professor social science, Monmouth College, 1922-23; associate professor 1923-24; professor and chemistry department, 1924-27; assistant professor political science, Vanderbilt, 1928, associate professor, 1930, professor, 1938, chemistry department, 1940, research professor 1951-61, professor emeritus, 1961-. Instructor at Iowa State Teachers College, summers 1926-27. Penfield traveling scholar, 1932-33, 1938-39; member Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1946, 1948, 1949; adviser atomic energy section; State Department, 1946. Foreign editor Nashville Evening Tennessean, 1934-37; foreign commentator, WSM, 1939-47; radio commentator Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 1944-46, director 1950-55; Fulbright lecturer Conference on American Studies Cambridge U., 1954, School of International Studies, New Delhi, 1959-60. With AEF World War I. Member American Association of University Professors (member executive council), American Committee in Geneva Staff, 1932, American Academy Political and Social Science, American Political Science Association (vice president, 1943), Southern Political Science Association (president, 1941), Phi Beta Kappa Associates, Acacia, Delta Sigma Rho, Kappa Delta Pi, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Democrat, Methodist, Mason. Club: Nashville Round Table (president, 1937). Author: "The Treaty Veto of the American Senate," 1930; "The United States and the League of Nations (1918-20)", 1932; "The United States and World Organization (1920-33)", 1938; "Can We Win the Peace?" 1943; "While America Slept," 1944; "The United States and the World Court," 1945; "The Cold War and Its Origins (1917-1960)," Vols. I and II, 1961. Home: 4721 Sewanee Road, Nashville 4, Tenn.

EXHIBIT 2

WHAT IS OUR ROLE IN EAST ASIA?

(By D. F. Fleming, Vanderbilt University)

(NOTE.—D. F. Fleming is emeritus professor of International Relations at Vanderbilt University and the author of a two-volume history of "The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-60." He has recently served as visiting professor at the University of Arizona.)

The cold war is nearly 20 years old and it is obviously waning in its main theater. During World War II Roosevelt and Hull labored long to create a basis for making and keeping the peace in cooperation with the Soviet Union, the great ally which had borne the heavy brunt of the fighting on land and suffered most from death and destruction. However, when Roosevelt and Hull passed from the scene in 1945 their successors abruptly reversed their policies and opted for conflict with the Soviet Union over East Europe, and for the containment and encirclement of both the Soviets and communism throughout the world.

The same complete reversal of healing policies had happened twice before in our history, after the death of Lincoln and after the fall of Wilson. In 1918 the tragic results of the reversal were delayed, but they came inexorably. The stupidities and agonies and infinite wastes of World War I had convinced many millions of the best citizens the world over that a new start had to be made, a League of Nations must be created that would get all the nations into one body and prevent any more suicidal balance-of-power wars between rival alliances. Never in all human history had an overpowering need been so clear and clamant, yet it was quickly denied in the U.S. Senate, where the opponents of Woodrow Wilson preferred to return to isolation and let the world drift as before. Our lead in refusing responsibility for the peace was followed by Britain and France in the crises of the League of Nations and the world drifted into a far worse world war in 1939.

We do not know that our leadership in the League of Nations would have made the difference, but we do know that we did not try to make it succeed, except futilely on the fringes of the League during the Manchurian crisis in 1931-32. In 1945 we dutifully created another League of Nations and entered it, but we also plunged at once into two crusades—an old-fashioned balance-of-power fight with the Soviet Union and a crusade against communism everywhere. In other words, we heavily overcompensated for the failure of isolationism by coming close to assuming responsibility for everything everywhere in the world.

Our quick assumption of global responsibility was signaled by Churchill's Iron Curtain speech at Fulton, Mo., in March 1946, in Truman's applauding presence, and by the proclamation a year later of the Truman doctrine, forbidding the expansion of communism anywhere and in effect forbidding all revolutions around the globe, since they might turn Communist.

The Truman doctrine was the rashest and most sweeping commitment ever made by any government at any time. In it Mr. Truman followed his own inclinations, and those of the advisers to whom he listened, and at the same time sought to foil his Republican critics, who had won the congressional elections of 1946 on charges of softness on communism. No man ever gave greater hostages to fortune. Within 2 years the success of the Communist-led revolution in China punched a hole in Truman's doctrine as big as a continent, one containing the world's largest and oldest people. A year later, in 1950, the Korean war broke out and President Truman was compelled to defend his global policy in what became a long frustrating war. His Republican opponents at first applauded, but in the end they saddled him with "Tru-

March 29, 1965

5994

man's war," and it was primarily responsible for the defeat of his party in the 1952 election. Eisenhower went to Korea, as he had promised, and afterward accepted a stalemate peace.

Then for some 7 years under the leadership of John Foster Dulles our objective was "liberation" and the "rollback" of both communism and Russia in Europe. The Soviets did accept a negotiated withdrawal from Austria and they withdrew voluntarily from Finland, but the main lines of their World War II advance held. This was not strange, after what happened at Munich in 1938.

During the long years of the cold war we were taught that there was a great Red monolith which controlled all Communists everywhere, including the Chinese. Today, everybody knows that there is the deepest kind of split between Russia and China and that all the Communist states of East Europe are evolving lives of their own, usually in the direction of somewhat more freedom at home and better relations with the West. After leading the world in spending at least a trillion dollars on cold war armaments we have not been able to reverse the main result of World War II in Europe. There has been no rollback and we have come to understand that the terribly exhausted and devastated Soviet Union of the postwar years was both incapable of attempting and unwilling to attempt the world conquest which our post-Roosevelt leaders so hastily ascribed to her, and which we soon accepted as our first article of national faith.

In his last months President Kennedy gave us magnificent leadership in the direction of ending the cold war. In his address at American University, on June 11, 1963, he acknowledged Russia's abysmal post-war weakness and called for a reappraisal of our attitudes toward her and toward the cold war. President Johnson has also furthered this trend.

But there remains the Far East. There, Communist China has weathered severe setbacks and is gathering strength. She is also still in the militant stage of her revolution and very angry at us because of our support of the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa and in the mouths of two Chinese harbors, because of our tremendous military power on Okinawa and along her coasts, and because of our other blockades of every kind—economic, diplomatic, and political. Moreover, she sees us occupying and fortifying the tips of two peninsulas on the Asiatic mainland, Korea and Vietnam, which are very close to her heartland. All the conditions for deep and permanent resentment on China's part are present.

For our part the prosecution of the cold war in Asia has always aroused the strongest emotions of our political rightwing. The defection of China to communism had not been expected and it has never been forgiven. Nor has a much wider section of our people been able to forget the bitter frustrations of the Korean war. So why not simply turn the focus of the cold war toward the Far East and keep our tremendous arms expenditures going another decade or two? And why not really push the cold war to "victory" in Asia?

Before we go in this direction we should soberly review our involvements in Asia and try to ascertain what our objectives there are.

Korea

Korea is a good place to begin.¹ What does the record show there? It shows first, that we proposed the division of Korea at the 38th Parallel to prevent the Russians from occupying all of Korea, which they could easily have done, and that they readily agreed. When our occupation forces finally

arrived in Korea, on September 8, 1945, General Hodge found a Peoples Republic government already organized by a national assembly representing all Korea. He suppressed this broadly representative government in the south; and in the north the Russians managed to install their kind of rule. In the south we set up a rightist tyranny under Syngman Rhee, which was soon decisively repudiated in the election of May 30, 1950.

Contrary to the almost universal assumption, we do not know which side began the shooting in Korea on June 25. We do know that the North Koreans were well armed and ready and that they had been conducting a propaganda campaign for unification, but Rhee's government had been publicly threatening for months to march north. It had been defeated at the polls and may have been desperate. We do not know, either, that the Soviet government was behind the swift North Korean invasion of the South. It was boycotting the U.N. Security Council at the time, in support of seating Red China in the U.N., and was not present to veto U.N. action in South Korea's defense. If Moscow knew about the invasion, would it commit such an obvious blunder?

We know that that the U.N. quickly approved the Truman administration's almost instant decision to fight to defend South Korea, and that on October 7, 1950, it very reluctantly approved our new objective of going north to destroy the North Korean government and unify Korea by force, the same thing which the North Koreans had attempted. This decision, as I see it, was the greatest single foreign policy mistake in our history. It converted a small war, already won, into a dreadful catastrophe which devastated Korea from end to end, killed some 2 million people and wounded another 3 million. By the time the war ended South Korean military casualties alone had risen to 1,312,836 and the other side suffered a still greater slaughter.² Indeed, in the latter stages of the war our Army frankly labeled its objective to be "Operation Killer." The Korean war also cost us 144,173 American casualties and led us into the huge armaments budgets which still continue.

Is this the kind of solution toward which we are sliding gradually in South Vietnam? Before we answer "Yes, we must win," we should reflect on the results in Korea. There, after more than 10 years, Rhee's oppressive government was finally overthrown by national student uprisings, to be succeeded by a veiled military dictatorship. In South Korea we maintain an army of 600,000 Koreans, the fourth largest army in the world, most of whom would otherwise be unemployed or underemployed. Yet we also keep there on the front line 52,000 American combat troops which cost us more than \$100 million a year. This is a part of the approximately \$3 billions annually which our worldwide military forces cost us—about the same as our annual balance-of-payments deficit, which we have had steadily since the Korean war buildup in 1950. Because of these ever-mounting foreign deficits we now owe \$25 billion in short-term indebtedness abroad and have only \$4 billion in un earmarked gold to cover it. Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, has asked recently if this is to go on forever, in a discussion of "The Korean Paralysis."³ What would happen if there should be a bad economic weather in the world and a run on New York?

South Korea's Plight

What, too, is to be done about South Korea? Her agricultural economy is too weak to support her 25 millions, rapidly increasing, while in North Korea there are minerals, water power, and industries enough to make

all Korea viable. The South Koreans know this and nothing can suppress a deep and growing yearning for the reunification of Korea, which would enable all to live in at least relative decency. We are apparently trying to turn South Korea back to Japan, but the South Koreans bitterly resent that kind of solution. Are we incapable of any constructive thinking about the Korean problem? Or shall we wait until events take it out of our hands? Do we really want to subsidize the unhappy South Koreans forever?

A dispatch from Seoul to the New York Times on May 31, 1964, states that discontent is running high, along with rapid inflation, that we had to send more than 1 million tons of food last year, that "20 percent of South Korea's work force is unemployed and other heavy proportions are underemployed." But for the moment martial law, declared after conference with our officials in South Korea, represses student riots and demonstrations.⁴

Vietnam

As unrest simmers in South Korea what is the situation in Vietnam, another Asiatic peninsula?⁵ There, during World War II, we at first aided the Communist-led revolution of Ho Chi Minh against the Japanese and the French. But later, as soon as the Communist nature of the revolution became evident, we took the side of the French in their effort to reimpose their colonial rule on the Vietnamese. Then our Government increasingly poured every kind of aid into the hands of the French, deluging them with weapons and aid to the value of some \$3 billion, but they could not win. With infinitely less aid from China the Vietnamese bled the French Army until by 1954 the French people could stand no more. Secretary of State Dulles fought hard to prevent the making of peace. He and Admiral Radford had plans for entering the war ourselves, but the reluctance of Congress and President Eisenhower prevented that and all of Mr. Dulles' threats could not avert the calling of a peace conference at Geneva. However, Mr. Dulles' stance of "angry negation" did prevent the victorious Vietminh from taking control of all of their country. Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel, another tragic victim of the cold war.

Then after 8 years of French defeat the United States moved into South Vietnam in 1954 and set up another despot, Ngo Dinh Diem, who with Dulles' backing refused to permit the elections which the Geneva Conference had called for to unify the country, because he knew the other side would win. Washington stood behind the misuse of Diem's family for nearly 10 years, until it finally led to an army rebellion last year. We backed the Diem tyranny because the Communists had renewed guerrilla war soon after the elections were frustrated, as they were expected to do. Lt. Gen. S. T. Williams, chief U.S. military adviser in South Vietnam at the time, wrote in U.S. News & World Report on November 9, 1964, that he was instructed to expect attack from the north when the deadline for the elections expired in July 1956 without their being held.

This new war is now more than 6 years old and it is reaching the proportions of the earlier one. Again we have poured in billions in weapons and supplies, and we have sent some 22,000 American officers and troops to train the city boys of Saigon and other towns to go out into the jungles and fight their rural brothers, which they are not keen about doing.⁶ We tell ourselves that the

¹ D. F. Fleming, "The Cold War and its Origins, 1917-60" (New York: Doubleday, 1961), II, 589-661.

² Encyclopedia Americana, p. 387; Time, Nov. 13, 1950, p. 23.

³ The Nation, Apr. 16, 1964, pp. 347-48.

⁴ Arizona Daily Star, June 4, 1964 (New York Times service).

⁵ Fleming, op. cit., pp. 667-706.

⁶ The extreme difficulty of inducing our proteges to become victorious fighters has been described many times in the dispatches,

Vietcong rebels are from North Vietnam—and some of them are, but relatively few.

The facts about who the rebels are have been stated in an authoritative book by Prof. Robert Scigliano of Michigan State University. This university worked in South Vietnam under a large U.S. contract until the operation fell under Diem's disfavor. It is Scigliano's judgment that only a small part of the Vietcong come from North Vietnam and that nearly all of these have been southerners who withdrew to the north after the Geneva agreements. The claim of massive infiltration from the north, he says, "does not appear to be supported by the available evidence." This was verified in the New York Times as recently as July 5, 1964. In other words, even the Vietcong from the north are patriots fighting in the land of their birth, and this is true even if they were born and trained in North Vietnam.

For many years our correspondents on the spot have testified that the Vietcong were arming themselves by taking American weapons from our side. This has not been too difficult, since there is a false relationship between our officers and the conscripted youth of the towns, often seized forcibly. When two companies in an ambush broke and ran, "We beat them back to their positions with rifle butts, but finally there was no holding them," said U.S. Capt. Ralph C. Thomas. He added that this was the second time in 10 months that one battalion had fallen into ambush by violating the most elementary rules, and that some Vietnamese officers refuse to discuss battle plans in advance or even to consider American advice when it is offered. To most of them the Americans' chief function is to provide equipment, supplies, and air cover. (AP dispatch from Tra On, Vietnam, by John T. Wheeler. The Arizona Daily Star, Dec. 20, 1964.)

It should have been evident to us from the start that we cannot go into a far country and teach the youth to fight a deadly war against their brothers for our reasons. Failure was surely indicated by the ability of the North Vietnamese and Chinese to filter arms into South Vietnam, on the backs of men and in small boats at night, as they have been doing steadily in recent months. These supplies are rivulets, when compared to the mighty flood of war machines of every kind which we pour into South Vietnam, but they are sufficient to tighten steadily the Vietcong ring around Saigon.

In its environs one of our supply ships has been sunk in port, a major airport has been shelled devastatingly and a hotel full of our officers bombed with grievous results. No American is safe, and a returning ship's officer reports that few Vietnamese shops will sell him anything lest they be bombed by the Vietcong.

These rebels have the most vital things that men can fight for at stake, and it does not make them less determined to win when we destroy their villages and families with high explosives and napalm and defoliate their countryside with chemicals. We must not think that in using these methods we

but never more clearly than in one from Malcolm W. Browne to the New York Times (and Portland Oregonian) on July 23, 1964. Referring to the apparently incurable habit of our trainees of getting themselves massacred in ambushes, a "high American officer" said "We're begging, we're pleading, we're reminding them [the Vietnamese troops], we're cajoling: we cry, we stamp out in fury, we do everything, we bring them ice cream. But we haven't succeeded." What more could we do to make ferocious fighters out of people who don't have their hearts in it?

Robert Scigliano, South Vietnam, Nation Under Stress (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963), p. 148.

are killing Vietcong alone, for much larger numbers of villagers also die. A dispatch of March 22 from Saigon to the Arizona Daily Star says: "The spectacle of children lying half alive with napalm burns across their bodies was revolting to both Vietnamese and Americans who entered the village."

This is one reason why the Vietcong are winning the war. They control and govern some two-thirds of South Vietnam and there is small reason to believe that there will be time to put into effect the plans which we have for mastering the country and making it into a showcase of contented living. The South Vietnamese have been fighting for nearly 20 years, first against French rule, then against American control, and they are desperately tired of the never-ending strife. They may turn neutralist at any time.

In these circumstances we hear increasingly demands and plans for bombing North Vietnam, to stop all aid from the north. It is wholly righteous for us to pour mountainous aid, including many troops, into South Vietnam, but diabolically wicked for trickles of aid to come in from North Vietnam. The advocates of victory at any price see these supply routes destroyed first, then the cities of North Vietnam, if necessary, and finally those of China, if the Chinese intervene, as they have already promised to do if we attack North Vietnam. They made the same pledge when we invaded North Korea in 1950. It is questioned now that the Soviets would honor their alliance obligations to defend China against us, yet Walter Lippmann warned us, on July 3, that "we must avoid the extreme of wishful thinking, which is to believe that in a war between China and the United States the Soviet Union would be neutral or on our side." We should remember, too, that on February 25, 1964, the Soviet Union warned the United States that if we extend the war into North Vietnam the Soviet people would render "the necessary assistance and support" to "the national liberation struggle in South Vietnam." We might recall thoughtfully also that years of bombing everything in sight in Korea did not give us victory there. There, too, we had total control of the air.

It is quite true that China is in poor shape to fight and it is equally true that from our bases off her shores we have the power in turn China into a vast, helpless morass, or a desert, with our conventional and atomic bombs. The targets are all pinpointed, ready for the death of unlimited millions of Chinese. If it be granted that a nuclear world war could be avoided, we have the power to work our will upon China. Yet it does not follow that the Chinese leaders would fail to go to the aid of North Vietnam if we attack her. They believe deeply in the kind of war which won them control of China and which is winning in South Vietnam. There is also strong reason to believe that they think we would not risk the worldwide consequences of destroying their country with our superweapons.

This is the alternative to making peace which faces us. On August 3, 1964, the reliable Australian correspondent Denis Warner described the continued administrative and military decline in South Vietnam; the relentless rise of the Vietcong forces to some 250,000, including battle-tested reserves; and Ho Chi Minh's ability to send his 15 divisions throughout southeast Asia, followed by "the Chinese divisions that lie behind." Saying flatly that victory for the South Vietnamese Government is out, Warner could find no military counter within our capacity except nuclear war. In other words, we would have to destroy Vietnam, at least, perhaps most of southeast Asia and presumably China, to win. "The war," he said, "would have to be nuclear or it would be lost."

* The New York Times, Feb. 26, 1964.

Why Are We in Vietnam?

Before we slide gradually into such a human and moral catastrophe we ought to ask ourselves very carefully what it is that we are fighting for in South Vietnam. For "freedom," it is most commonly said. That is a word that comes easily to the tongue and there is no doubt that the Asiatic Communists do live under many regimentations and controls. On the other hand, there is small reason to believe that we could win a fair election in South Vietnam and no reason to believe that we could win an election covering the entire country. Among other reasons, the Vietnamese know that degrading poverty and destitution have been eliminated in China, and the liberty to eat is an elemental one. They would vote also for freedom from war and foreign control.

In the Eisenhower years it used to be said that we must not lose the tungsten mines and rubber plantations of South Vietnam. The latter are still mainly in French hands, and the French want the war stopped to save their investments. They still have half a billion dollars to lose. There is also much surplus rice in South Vietnam, of which we too have a surplus. But in the last analysis our reason for being in South Vietnam, beyond economic motives, is a belief that this peninsula is an extremely strategic spot and that if it "went" Communist all southeast Asia and beyond would turn Red.

This is the domino theory which has been used to justify every move in the cold war. In 1947 it was said that if Greece went Communist so would Turkey, the Middle East, Iran, and beyond. So, too, would Italy and France in the West. In 1950 the Korean war was justified in the same way. We have been taught likewise that if Formosa were lost the Chinese would soon take the Philippines, then Hawaii, then Catalina Island, and our own Pacific coast.

Under this theory any American intervention anywhere in the world can be justified. If South Vietnam goes, it is said, then a long set of standing dominoes will fall down through New Zealand to the south polar continent, which fortunately has been neutralized. But would they? The Vietnamese are a tough and patriotic people. They were ruled by China for centuries and have no wish to be again. Nor is there any evidence that Red China has dominated North Vietnam or North Korea. On the contrary, she has helped them both to industrialize, from her own limited means. China hopes to cut a big figure politically throughout the vast underdeveloped Southern Hemisphere. Would she begin by making colonies out of her small neighbors? North Vietnam and China do need the surplus rice of South Vietnam, but would they take it without payment?

Of course it is unthinkable to us that South Korea or South Vietnam should become Communist, but is that automatically involved in peace settlements which would neutralize both states by international agreements between the great powers, including China?

It would be a great gain to establish peace between the divided halves of Vietnam and Korea and permit them to trade with each other. There could be many slow stages in the drawing together of the north and south states. Neither would, or should, give up its presently established life quickly or without compromises and guarantees. I venture the belief that we cannot prevent the reunion of these divided peoples indefinitely, but that we can decide whether it is to be done gradually and by agreement, by revolution, or by war.

War with China?

Peaceful agreements would of course involve moderating our hostility to China, but is that really impossible? I well remember how we used to love the Chinese, when they

were ragged, docile heathens, the subjects of our devoted missionary efforts. But since they became fighting men and Reds I note that they have become totally wicked. However, I observe also that we have been able to start ending the cold war with the equally wicked Russians after they gained missile power capable of destroying us.

This, too, will happen in China in the next 10 or 20 years, after which there will be no question of our clinging to the fringes of China and occupying islands in the Formosa Strait which she believes to be hers. When China gains the power to destroy us she will take control of the fringes of east Asia and leave it to us to convert a local war into a world holocaust. The basic choice before us is between destroying China with our nation-killing weapons soon or beginning to make peace with her, as the other nations of the world are doing. We must choose the latter course if we are to remain a civilized people, and we could begin by permitting China to take the seat in the United Nations which is guaranteed to her by its charter, before the other members seat her anyway. Then we could work for the neutralization and real self-government of the people of Formosa, while that is still a possible solution.

It is unreasonable to suppose that we can much longer control the entire Pacific Ocean, including the edges of Asia, against the will of the great powers and vast populations which live there. As in Europe, we shall have to accept the fact that World War II did have great and irreversible consequences in Asia. Max Freedman wrote from London on May 28 that "it is difficult for any British official to feel that Washington can have any enduring influence over the affairs of Laos and Vietnam, except at a price in men and money which the American people will refuse to pay."⁹ On May 17 James Reston wrote that the French had learned three things: that however much the Vietnamese might differ from the Chinese they hated them less than the white man; that they are tough soldiers; and that no Western power could be established against China's borders."¹⁰

We are now learning the same things the same hard way, but fortunately we do have leaders who recognize the inevitable. With his usual courage and candor, Senator WAYNE MORSE was the first high official to challenge the futility of our adventure in South Vietnam. He pointed out that we have always considered southeast Asia to be beyond our defense perimeter and demanded an end to our Vietnamese adventure. On March 10, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, made the same demand. He asked that we stop wasting billions of dollars "seeking vainly in this remote jungle to shore up self-serving corrupt dynasts or their self-imposed successors." He considered every additional life sacrificed in this forlorn adventure a tragedy. He did not say, either, every "American" life. On February 19, 1964, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader in the Senate, made a deeply impressive address in which he denied that any American national interest justified our assumption of primary responsibility in the Vietnamese war. "We have," he said, "teetered too long on the brink of turning the war in Vietnam, which is still a Vietnamese war, into an American war to be paid for primarily with American lives."¹¹ He was strongly supported by Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, who deplored the way in which our policy in southeast Asia was "locked in rigid, inflexible terms." He urged greater support of President de Gaulle's diplomacy, which calls for neutralizing Vietnam, and a less emotional and less abusive discussion of Communist China.

On March 25, 1964, Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, made his historic address on thinking unthinkable thoughts. He did not ask for our withdrawal from Vietnam, but he did condemn the "relegating of an increasing number of ideas and viewpoints to a growing category of 'unthinkable thoughts.'" He noted that when we refuse to believe something because it displeases or frightens us, "then the gap between fact and perception becomes a chasm and actions become irrelevant and irrational." He urged us to think "about the festering war in Vietnam."

On July 10 a statement signed by 5,000 university professors was issued in Washington calling for the neutralization of North and South Vietnam.¹²

It was doubtless impossible for the Johnson administration to move in the direction of making peace in southeast Asia and with China until after the 1964 political campaign was over. Now it will fail to do so at its peril. A Lou Harris opinion poll has already shown that more people favored neutralizing South Vietnam than opposed it, and that 45 percent opposed expanding the war to North Vietnam and only 26 percent favored escalation.¹³ President Johnson must know, also, that the Republicans won the 1952 election on the frustrations of the Korean war and that they could win in 1968 on the frustrations of another endless war to regulate affairs on China's borders. Surely the President is astute enough to avoid carrying the albatross onus of a "Johnson's war." On the other hand, he can carry the country with him if he exerts strong leadership in making peace in Asia. The current Republican demand for victory and liberty in every part of the world is nothing less than a demand for American domination of the earth, but it is far too late for that. We have learned the limits of our power in Europe, and the limitations of our sway in Asia must also be learned. This will be very painful, since, as George Kennan said recently, the American tendency is "to view any war in which we might be involved not as a means of achieving limited objectives * * * but as a struggle to the death between total virtue and total evil."¹⁴

Our greatest investment in Vietnam is in prestige, but is our prestige to be conserved by making a bad matter steadily worse? It cannot truthfully be denied that the results of our efforts in Korea and Vietnam have been in both cases: division and tyranny, war and desolation, poverty and unhappiness for these small peoples. We have also achieved almost exactly the same results in Laos. Is this the way to conserve the prestige of the leader of the free world? And is wise and courageous action on our part to end such evils incapable of generating prestige?

The Urgency of Negotiation

The first essential is to recognize that our gamble in Vietnam has failed. In the 6 months since this article was first written the situation has gone from bad to much worse, both militarily and politically. Coup has succeeded coup and the military defeats have grown in magnitude. We tried hard to prove that we could learn antiguerrilla war, for application on all continents, and we have failed. We could not succeed as alien mentors against the will of the Vietnamese people. Now there are almost no moral resources left in South Vietnam for continuing the war. Twenty years of it are more than enough.

Yet, astoundingly, there are people in Washington who now propound the doctrine of going on with the manageable mess. Newsweek reported this development on January 11, 1965, quoting a specialist as saying:

"It may take 10 years or more of no-win and no-lose. * * * But with the resources at hand we can control this thing and bring it to a satisfactory conclusion."

This assumption that the long deterioration in South Vietnam can somehow be held in suspension defies all of the forces which are operating there. As one commentator on the 1964 CBS Annual World Affairs Roundup said about Diem's 10 years as our man in Saigon, these were wasted years. We supported an image, an illusion. Shall we now waste another decade in trying to support a kaleidoscope of unpopular rulers?

This is a self-defeating endeavor. As W. M. Bagby observed in the New York Times on December 5, "The more overt our intervention, the more Saigon appears to be our puppet. We cannot successfully support dictatorships propped up by feudal lords and white men," and "China cannot be kept out of South East Asia by white men." If our basic purpose is to keep her quiet, we would defeat it by extending the war and bringing in Chinese troops. Only a negotiated settlement can really forestall the entry of Chinese troops, first into North Vietnam and then in the South—an eventuality that all Vietnamese dread.

Inevitably, too, by our very presence in Vietnam we are dealing with China. We are not dealing simply with the 3 million people in the corrupt city of Saigon, but with some 40 million Vietnamese, with about three-quarters of a billion Chinese, and with the Korean people. Each of these three nations is determined to have unity and freedom from foreign control, including ours.

Objections to Negotiation

But, it is said, our whole Asian policy would crumble if we turned toward negotiations with Peiping. The reply is, said Emmett Hughes in Newsweek, January 11, 1965: "We do not seriously possess an Asian policy. Since World War II we have simply rushed—or stumbled—toward various ramparts." He might have added that this is the very essence of the Truman doctrine, which launched us upon our antirevolutionary career.

To the objection that we cannot negotiate from weakness, Hughes replies that the truth is that one only negotiates from a position of weakness. Victors impose terms. He denies also that we have no negotiable assets to employ. We could offer to reduce our forces in Korea sharply, without eliminating a tripwire there, and China greatly needs trade with us.

This is one of those rare moments when levelheaded men in the Congress and among our citizens can exert themselves effectively to turn their country from a bankrupt course into one that would bring both honor and profit to us. Time, too, is short. General de Gaulle is almost certainly right in believing that each succeeding month will see the growth of Communist strength in South Vietnam. We might remember also that it was the never-ending losses of French officers that signalized French defeat in Vietnam. Yet we have already committed enough of our instructor officers and noncoms to Vietnam to man 4 of our 16 divisions, and we have already suffered 1,800 casualties. (Bernard B. Fall, in the New Republic, Jan. 16, 1965.) Are we incapable of learning from the hard experience of others?

But the warhawks cry in unison: "If we accept neutralization that will certainly be followed soon by a Communist takeover." That could be. The longrun probability is that all of Korea and Vietnam may have to live through a period of evolving communism, just as the East Europeans are. It is certain that peace in South Vietnam would mean strong participation in the Government by the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong. But it does not follow that a coalition government would fail. James Robinson, the southeast Asia

⁹ Arizona Daily Star.

¹⁰ New York Times.

¹¹ Ibid., Feb. 20, 1964.

¹² Portland Oregonian, July 11, 1964.

¹³ Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1964.

¹⁴ New York Times, July 1, 1964.

expert of NBC, said on December 29: "What we are fighting in Vietnam is a historical evolution. A neutrality there like Cambodia's is feasible. What we would have would be a coalition government that would last a long time."

Is this a worse prospect than deepening anarchy in South Vietnam and a complete Communist takeover? Peter Grose reported from Saigon in the New York Times on November 8 that the National Liberation Front (which is not entirely Communist) already has a shadow government which covers all of South Vietnam, "backed by powerful professional and guerrilla forces and biding its time for a moment when leaders in Saigon turn in desperation to request a cease-fire. These parallel hierarchies, wrote C. L. Sulzberger on January 14, "have spread inexorably as Saigon's national administration has rotted. The fractional area it still holds is contested by rival warlords and political cliques. The disaster hitherto nibbling at our heels now stares us in the face."

What is feasible?

How much longer, too, can we continue to treat enormous China as something which does not exist, but which must be surrounded and contained? Surely this is an immaturity which we can no longer afford. We need to remember rapidly that the Chinese are not only the largest people in the world but by far the oldest in civilization, and perhaps the ablest. Certainly they have an unparalleled ability to survive. They are now united and strongly organized to advance into the 20th century. It will be infinitely better for us to help them with trade than to fear and hate and fight them. Again it is left to west coast leaders to see this, Gov. Pat Brown, of California, recently said in Washington: "We have tried to get the world to join us in rejecting all economic and political ties with China." This policy "has failed, as the steady increase in trade with the Chinese Communists demonstrates. All we have left is the vigorous hostility of the Chinese which our policy has provoked."¹⁵

It is time we realized that such hatreds and such adventures as the Vietnamese war cannot be afforded. Twice in my lifetime the world has lived through the long agonies of world war. In 1914 the big governments blundered, stumbled, and slid into war. Before 1939 three raging-tearing aggressor governments plunged the world into war—Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, and Tojo's Japan. Today we are having our very last chance to organize all of the governments and peoples—including the Chinese—into one group, the United Nations, for the purpose of establishing law and order and cooperation among them, in the atomic age. If we fail in this, Western civilization, at the least, will cease to exist. The choice before us is that simple and plain.

We must therefore shake off the current dangerous delusion that strong-arm tactics cannot only seize control of a great political party but get us anything we want in the world. We must work instead to establish a world community of all the peoples, while there is still time. "Let us," said President Kennedy more than a year ago, "make the most of this opportunity and every opportunity, to reduce tension, to slow down the perilous arms race, and to check the world's slide to final annihilation."¹⁶

This is certainly the only feasible course to take. It means giving up some of our aspirations for power on China's borders, some of our fixations that all Communist rule is wholly vile and that the law of social evolution never works in Communist countries. If power is what we must live by, we

can still patrol most of the vast Pacific Ocean with our great sea and air armadas. We can still defend the Philippines from invasion, as we should, and perhaps Japan, though we cannot much longer prevent a large trade and closer relations between Japan and China. We can also help to stabilize the great Indonesia-Malaysia region.

A very impressive book by Robert G. Wesson has demonstrated with great cogency that our economic power base is declining rapidly, relative to the rest of the world. "Already," he warns, "the day is late." Since 1945 our power "to shape events has shrunk to less than half of what it was" and "the next 15 years may well see America's potential in the world halved again." Instead of opposing the rise of other powers, he urges us to accept the reality of becoming "one of several equals" in a multipolar world. The United States, he cautions, "does not have leisurely time to become accustomed to a world changing to its detriment." His final admonition is that "the fixation of the cold war obscures vision, but reason can still play a part in making the best of an unpromising and worsening situation. With cool thought, much can be done to bring to pass that civilization means good, not evil."¹⁷

Certainly we will fail in the Pacific unless we look beyond power to friendly relations with China, to helping her to improve the life of her great people, as the Russians have already improved theirs, thus joining the ranks of the more contented and satisfied peoples. We have become good neighbors with the Japanese, whose Hiroshima ashes tell them that they can have no future war with China. The same ashes, which we do not like to remember, should tell us that we too must become good neighbors with China and that this is the best way to be truly helpful to her small neighbors, who could become prosperous if we removed from them the grievous burdens of arms, war, and sun-drenched nationhoods.¹⁸

The escalation course

As this article is printed, the alternative is all too clear. No one could read the eight main articles and leading editorial in the New York Times of February 14, 1965, without knowing that the United States had started on a collision course toward a nuclear world war, one which would kill 100 million of us. (McNamara's figure.)

If the Vietnamese war is escalated much further, no man may be able to stop it. Or, if catastrophe be avoided, we are headed toward a vast "limited" war throughout east Asia with the North Vietnamese, Chinese, and North Korean armies, a war which could not be won. Nor would the responsibility be accepted or borne—in 1968 or at any time—by the leading voices now crying for more and bigger bombings, including China's nuclear installations. If holocaust or exhaustion are to be avoided, President Johnson is entitled to strong and insistent backing by his true supporters for a policy of making peace in the Far East. The disaster alleged to be in-

¹⁷ Robert G. Wesson, "The American Problem: the Cold War in Perspective" (New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1963), pp. 6, 276, 280.

¹⁸ On July 27, 1964, Newsweek (p. 41) published a careful estimate of China's readiness for war with us over Vietnam. It described modern new Chinese towns along the border; "about 300,000 troops in the area, with another 200,000 in reserve"; two full air force armies with 1,200 jet fighter planes nearby; and thousands of Vietnamese training in the hills.

On July 18 Henry Tanner cabled from Moscow to the New York Times that Soviet officials have made it plain to foreigners on many occasions that the Kremlin could not hope to avoid being dragged into any full-scale war in Vietnam involving the United States.

involved in political falling dominoes is minor and uncertain when compared to the imminent peril of the escalating military ones.

Our good name in the world is also at stake. We cannot compensate for losing the guerrilla war by imperiling everyone on earth. In the nuclear age there is no prestige in making war, or in trying to determine the internal affairs and civil wars of little nations everywhere. Nationalism is defeating all those who make this attempt, and it will continue to do so. There is prestige in leading for peace. In the terms of the Times editorial, this is a time to achieve greatness by restraint. It is also high time for a peace conference in which the United Nations plays the healing role for which Secretary General U Thant is so well fitted.

EXHIBIT 3

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
February 20, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: American policies in Vietnam:

1. Make a "scrap of paper" out of our solemn pledge to "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb" the 1964 Geneva agreements which prohibited "the introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions" and specified that "no military base under the control of a foreign state may be established."
2. Have added to history a second "day of infamy" with our bombing of North Vietnam, with which we are not at war.
3. Have killed American boys by the hundreds and Vietnamese by the tens of thousands.
4. Are trapping us into another Korea which will slaughter Americans by the thousands.
5. Have burned alive countless babies and mothers with the napalm we have supplied to drop on peasant villages where Vietcong are "suspected" of being.
6. Have saddled on the Vietnamese people an endless succession of undemocratic, barbarous and corrupt governments hated by the overwhelming mass of the people.
7. Assert America's right to dictate half the world away what kind of government any people may establish.
8. Are losing all Asia to us, making Asians hate and fear us as ruthless imperialists.
9. Are criminal "brinkmanship"—gambling with world war and the destruction of the human race.

These policies are utter madness and can only lead America to disaster.

Our security, national interest, and honor require that the United States agree to ending the war and negotiating peace, by reconvening the Geneva Conference in order to establish a free and independent South Vietnam which shall be neutral and without bases, military forces, or arms of any foreign state, and with a government democratically elected by all the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I implore you to take this honorable way out of the morass in southeast Asia in which we are being engulfed.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE H. LUSCOMB.

AMERICA WILL BE PROUD OF RAMPART DAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last month the Department of the Interior finally released a very important report on the market for power that will be produced at Rampart Dam on the Yukon River in Alaska. The massive study of the Interior Department encompasses research performed by all bureaus of the agency concerned with the Rampart

¹⁵ San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 27, 1964.
¹⁶ D. F. Fleming, "The Turn Toward Peace," the Annals, January 1964, pp. 157-169.

March 29, 1965

5998

project. Participating in preparation of the report were the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Alaska Railroad and the Geological Survey. The Department has emphasized that the report, which is approximately 1,000 pages long and divided into three parts, is a report of the field offices of the bureaus involved and does not represent the final Rampart recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior.

Upon release of the report, Secretary Udall appointed a six-man task force to make an analysis of the field reports with a view to developing the definitive recommendation of the Department on Rampart.

Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, and the organization he serves have long been strong supporters of the Rampart project and have given invaluable assistance to those who look forward eagerly to its construction. When the Department of the Interior released its recent report, Mr. Norwood made a prompt analysis of the document which is published in the March edition of the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin. As Mr. Norwood's knowledgeable commentary on the report is very useful to all who are interested in Rampart, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article "America Will Be Proud of Rampart Dam" be included in the record at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA WILL BE PROUD OF RAMPART DAM
 (By Gus Norwood)

The Nation that built Grand Coulee Dam, Hoover, Shasta, Fontana, and many other great works, now approaches the hour of decision on the greatest dam of all.

In a monumental report, the Department of the Interior agrees with the conclusions of the earlier Corps of Engineers report that Rampart Dam is feasible.

The long, rocky road toward construction of Rampart Dam in Alaska passed another milestone February 9, 1965, with publication of the three-volume, 998-page Department of the Interior "field report."

Secretary Stewart L. Udall initiated the next step by appointing a six-man task force to review the field report and consider the comments which will be submitted by the Governor of Alaska, Federal agencies and interested citizens and organizations.

CONSERVATIVE STUDY

The report is conservative and in fact leans over backward to consider possible negative factors, assumed high construction costs, slow development of markets, and full repayment within 50 years.

The 5-inch thick report is not available for public distribution. A limited number of copies has been issued to the reviewing agencies, major Alaska newspapers, key libraries, the Alaska congressional delegation and interested associations such as Yukon Power for America and the Northwest Public Power Association.

"Field Report, Rampart Project, Alaska, Market for Power and Effect of Project on Natural Resources," in three volumes, 998 pages, January 1965, 125 tables, 54 plates and 26 photographs, 8 by 10½ inches, com-

prising preface and 10 parts, transmitted February 9, 1965, by Burke Riley, Department of the Interior Regional Coordinator for Alaska to Col. Clare F. Farley, District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Anchorage, Alaska.

The report was prepared pursuant to the Army-Interior Agreement of March 14, 1962. It is a coordinated study prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Alaska Railroad and Geological Survey.

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW

To assist him in arriving at conclusions and recommendations for discussion with the Secretary of the Army, and for a joint recommendation to the President, the Secretary of the Interior on February 11, 1965, appointed a six-man task force headed by Henry P. Caulfield, Jr., Director of Interior's resources program staff; Joseph M. Morgan, Division of Water and Power Development; James T. McCbroom, Fish and Wildlife; Joseph C. McCaskill, Mineral Resources Division; Rod-erick H. Riley, Bureau of Indian Affairs; and Eugene Zumwalt, Bureau of Land Management.

RAMPART DAM FACTS

The project as designed by the Corps of Engineers calls for a 530-foot dam with a head of 465 feet, 230-mile reservoir covering 10,600 square miles, with storage capacity of 1,265 billion acre-feet, 4-foot average annual drawdown, average annual flow of 113,000 cubic feet per second, reservoir filling period of 22 years, proposed 18 units of 280,000 kilowatts or 5,040,000 kilowatts producing 34.2 billion kilowatts per hour firm energy, with prime power of 3,904,000 kilowatts. Investment is estimated at \$1.1 billion plus \$650 to \$1,120 million for transmission plus a Fish and Wildlife request of \$580.5 million. Physically the dam would be somewhat smaller than Grand Coulee but produce 2½ times as much energy.

FIVE MARKETING CASES

For an assumed dam and transmission cost of \$1.85 billion the cost of power is estimated at 2.05 mills at bus bar and 3.48 at load centers.

The most pessimistic Case I, assuming very slow load growth, would result in delivered power at 4.62 to 7.01 mills leaving out Fish and Wildlife requests.

All five transmission case studies assume basic use of 500 kilovolts alternating current with two lines to the Juneau or Haines area, and either two or three to the Anchorage area.

Case IV includes the dramatic 500 kilovolt direct current line 2,000 miles to Snohomish at a \$514 million cost, 1,330,000 kilowatts delivery capacity and a delivery or transmission cost of 1.91 mills at 100 percent load factor and 2.72 mills at 70 percent load factor. To this transmission cost would be added the bus bar cost of 2.1 to 2.4 mills, thus making the Seattle price about 4 mills at 100 percent load factor and 5 mills at 70 percent load factor.

It remains to be seen whether construction cost would be as high as the \$375,000 per mile for 500 kilovolt transmission lines and \$210,000 per mile for wood pole 138 kilovolt. The figures appear too high.

Lowest costs are achieved for Case II-B at 3.33 mills at load centers assuming \$763 million for transmission. This assumes 3 percent interest and 50-year repayment of each portion of the dam using the first unit as a spare and then placing 1/17th of the dam in the payout schedule as each unit is placed in operation.

ALTERNATIVE POWER

Part VII of the report evaluates coal, oil, gas and nuclear alternatives, and the five best hydro projects in Alaska and concludes that Rampart is the best.

SCHEDULE

Filling of the reservoir could start as early as 1972 with first power in 1975 from five generators at low head operation. Low loading would permit filling the reservoir in 16 years, while heavy loading would delay the last units to as late as 2020. The report assumes full reservoir by 1993, but Case II assume 18th unit in 2010.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of a quick review of this report, the following tentative conclusions are submitted. Rampart is the lowest cost power source available to Alaska. The Fish and Wildlife requests are unreasonable. Nonetheless, hatcheries and fish spawning channels and studies to mitigate duck nesting problems are essential.

The assumption of 50-year repayment is utterly unreasonable. The charge-off of all costs to power violates the concept of multiple-purpose development. The report appears to be on the high side in estimating construction costs.

The Bureau of Reclamation should be complimented on the outstanding depth and thoroughness in making the studies of alternative power sources and the five transmission case studies.

The evaluation of possibilities for developing each mineral appears narrow in view of the early stage of Alaska's mineral exploration. Under similar assumptions of counting only the sure known loads, the building of Grand Coulee Dam would have been delayed many, many years.

The report as a whole appears to be preoccupied with conventional feasibility in a situation which so obviously calls for a development-minded and pioneering-minded attack.

One indication of a more positive approach is the recognition that Rampart Dam would be helpful in bettering the lot of the natives through a higher standard of living and thus saving much money for other programs for natives.

By resolution and on the basis of the earlier power marketing report of the Development and Resources Corp., the membership of the Northwest Public Power Association voted to endorse the construction of Rampart Dam.

The fine-tooth comb study by the Department of the Interior justifies the association's full endorsement of the start of early construction.

As the task force and the various Federal agencies and the Governor of Alaska make their evaluation, it is suggested that major weight be given to the ground rules for this project.

First, the payout schedule should be set on the TVA basis of actual service life or 100 years, whichever is less.

It cannot sufficiently be emphasized that a 50-year-old hydro project of this scale is better than a brand new steam plant. It is ridiculous to pay off such a project as if it were an FHA mortgage on a frame house.

A major purpose of the project should be the economic development of Alaska and a reasonable cost allocation should be made for this purpose. Thereby Rampart Dam power would cost about 2 mills at the bus bar at 100 percent load factor, and then let the power marketing agency take it from there.

America will be proud of Rampart Dam. Let's get with it.

**TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING
 LEGISLATION**

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, S. 985, which was amended slightly from its original S. 387 of the 88th Congress—the so-called truth-in-packaging bill, was

referred recently to the Senate Commerce Committee rather than the Senate Judiciary Committee which had jurisdiction over said S. 387. In the House of Representatives, three packaging and labeling bills similar to S. 985 of this session have been referred to the House Judiciary Committee. At the time of referral to the Senate Commerce Committee, the Chair ruled that I or any Senator could move to have the said S. 985 referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee if it were reported out of the Senate Commerce Committee and called up for Senate action.

I have made my position clear in this matter in a released minority report on the packaging bill. I said it was bad for the public, bad for the consumer, bad for the workers involved, bad for the businessmen, and bad philosophy for Government and also Government's relations with business, workers, and consumers. The American Legion magazine asked that I state my views in very brief words. These views may be found on page 17 of the American Legion magazine, April, 1965 issue. Senator HART also expressed his views.

Mr. President, for the information of the Members of Congress and the public, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles on packaging and labeling be placed at this point of the RECORD in the order noted: "Who Said Shoppers Are Stupid," in Nation's Business, 1965, "Let's Keep Politics Out of the Pantry," by Charles G. Mortimer, chairman of General Foods Corp., in Look magazine, January 26, 1965; and, lastly, Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN's views against a Federal packaging law, namely, S. 985, in American Legion magazine, April 1965.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO SAYS SHOPPERS ARE STUPID?

A Nation's Business experiment finds that even inexperienced teenagers are not at all confused by packaging, pricing, or labeling.

A heart-tugging melodrama is playing in Washington these days, starring Connie the Confused Consumer in the role of typical American shopper.

Connie's ordeal takes place in an average supermarket, where alluring but deceptive labels leave her dazed and helpless.

In her moment of peril, Connie is rescued by Uncle Sam, armed with something called "Truth-in-Packaging."

This melodrama has received rave notices from some people in the Nation's capital.

But not from business. And not from most consumers. They see the melodrama as more fiction than fact.

Political concern about the consumer in recent years has been channeled into a drive for enactment of so-called truth-in-packaging legislation. It would give the Federal Government the power to set up new and complex controls and standards over the packaging and labeling of many consumer items.

This would be in addition to present Federal laws requiring purity and quality in foods and drugs, and honesty in packaging and labeling.

Nation's Business conducted its own experiment to test the need for greater consumer protection. The experiment showed that even young, inexperienced students can be intelligent and resourceful shoppers in today's supermarket, that they are neither befuddled nor deceived by what they buy.

Here is what happened:

Six teenaged girls and a home economics teacher were selected at random from Yorktown High School in Arlington, Va., a suburb of the Nation's Capital.

Each test shopper was given a list of 35 categories of food and household commodities. None of the volunteers was told the purpose of the test. None was told how much to spend, how many items to buy in the various categories, or which brands to select. Two of the students had no previous shopping experience and none was familiar with the supermarket used in the experiment. All shopped immediately after the terse briefing, after school hours, by themselves, and without consulting with the others. The school had no official connection with the experiment.

The only hints given were: "Buy as if you were a homemaker," and "Use your own judgment."

All items on the shopping list have been cited at one time or another in congressional hearings as fooling or confusing the Nation's housewives.

When the students completed their swings through the supermarket they were interviewed separately by a Nation's Business editor. In addition, their purchases (bagged and returned to the school) were carefully checked over by Mrs. Lucy Nicholas, a teacher of home economics at Yorktown High.

The experiment results showed that:

Purchases the girls made were—in the judgment of Mrs. Nicholas—intelligent.

They were able to buy with a minimum of wasted motion and with few requests for assistance from store personnel.

None had any difficulty understanding printed information concerning price, weight or content of the items she bought.

The experiment revealed other things about the young shoppers. It showed that they are very much aware of brand names, that they are well informed on new methods of packaging, and that they pick items off the shelf more on the basis of family influence and personal taste than price advantage.

A typical comment: "Sure, I knew that brand A was less expensive than brand B, but I bought Brand B anyway because I think it's a better product."

There was nothing in the test results which indicated that the shoppers found packaging and labeling deceptive.

Mrs. Patricia Bain, another home economics teacher at Yorktown High, also shopped the Nation's Business list.

Considering the sketchy briefings they got, the shoppers turned in surprisingly uniform performances, both as to the time they were in the store and the amounts they spent. Mrs. Bain shopped the longest—50 minutes—and spent the least. Her bill came to \$12.47.

Unlike the students, Mrs. Bain made mostly single-item buys in all 35 categories. Married, though with no children, she is accustomed to shopping for only her husband and herself—and for the limited storage capacity in their apartment.

"The youngsters really got more for their money than Mrs. Bain did," comments Mrs. Nicholas, "but their buying has to be considered in light of the fact that they come from larger families. They tended to shop more for specials and for a longer period."

Barbara Howe, a 17-year-old Yorktown senior, has a family that includes her parents, a 14-year-old sister and a Chihuahua. She says she definitely had "supply" in mind when she made her way through the supermarket aisles.

"I bought the large jar of instant coffee, for example. I can't see buying the small size or just one can or jar of something, because that means you'll have to come back to shop again real soon. To me, having something on hand—convenience—that's what's important."

Although Barbara was one of the fastest

shoppers in the group (40 minutes), she commented: "If I'd known the store better I could have cut my shopping time in half."

The students were not told how long a time period to buy for, but most—on their own initiative—set up a target of about a week, according to Mrs. Nicholas. She says the girls generally showed good judgment and bought wisely. "The way they conducted themselves indicates that they are closely observing how their parents shop," she adds.

WHAT THE LIST INCLUDED

The shopping lists handed to the six students and Mrs. Bain consisted of these items:

Canned goods: Pork and beans, peas, tomatoes, pineapple, plums, peaches, vegetable soup, chicken soup, tuna fish, chicken, crab meat.

Packaged goods: Dried beans, dry cereal, cocoa, instant potatoes, gelatin (flavored), fudge brownie mix, cake mix, tea, coffee, crackers, pudding.

Frozen products: Lemonade, orange juice, fish fillets, broccoli, peas.

Household and toiletry items: All-purpose cleanser, laundry detergent, dish detergent, paper napkins, paper towels, facial tissues, tooth paste, wax paper.

The store where the student volunteers shopped is a Kroger Co. supermarket, a typical suburban facility. Its manager, John Williams, an 8-year employee of the company, stocks 10,000 items in his shelves and display cases. In laundry detergents alone his customers may choose from no less than 10 different brands.

Here's a closer look at the youngsters:

Amber Ingram is a 16-year-old sophomore who had never shopped the Kroger store. In fact, she had done no supermarket shopping alone prior to the Nation's business experiment.

"I saw products I hadn't seen before and I feel that from now on I'll have more interest in the stores and what's in them."

Amber's bill came to \$18.10. She looked for specials, buying three cans of name-brand peaches, two boxes of a two-for-39-cent facial tissue, for example.

"I didn't need a pencil and paper to figure out what was the best buy. I did it in my head. I would just work out which was the best buy per can," she said.

"If it is something you can keep a long time, something that won't spoil or anything like that, you can afford to buy a larger quantity."

Any difficulty at all?

"No difficulty."

Barbara Howe, the 17-year-old senior, had home economics training only in the eighth grade. She does do the family shopping sometimes, but admits she's "usually in a fat hurry" when she does, which may account for her speedy trip through Kroger's. She had been in the store only a few times. Her sole difficulty was in locating the frozen fish.

Barbara's bill totaled \$15.22. She looked for multiple buys, too, although she feels that quality and brand names play the biggest part in her shopping decisions. When interviewed, she tossed around odd-size content figures and number-of-servings data like a seasoned homemaker.

Does she think it's deceptive for such things as cake mixes to depict the finished cake?

"I don't think that's deceptive at all. Who wants to look at a picture of cake powder?"

Does she think that shopping skill is something a girl can pick up on her own?

"If you've been eating for 17 years you can't help but learn something about food and food buying."

Barbara watches the ads for price fluctuations, especially in meat and produce.

Is there anything she doesn't like about shopping?

March 29, 1965

"Waiting in the checkout lines."

Joan Carolyn Welch was the other senior in the experiment. She's 17 and is taking a commercial course in high school.

Joan likes to shop. "I enjoy looking at the various brands and products on display. There's so much you should know. Like looking for specials. Food stores don't make much profit on what they sell, you know."

Her shopping bill was \$14.66. Another bargain-seeker, she scanned the cardboard sale notices as she moved through the store. She had no trouble with amounts expressed in fractions.

Joan says she often doesn't worry about how expensive an item is if she thinks it tastes better.

"Shopping is something a girl can pick up on her own," she said, "but you have to learn how to put together a nutritious, balanced menu. A home economics course can help you there."

Her only complaint about labeling: "Maybe more products could indicate the number of servings on the package. This helps when you're planning a meal."

Janet Carabin, 16, had never shopped alone for groceries. She hadn't been in the Kroger supermarket for a couple of years, but she quickly got her bearings by checking the overhead signs and aisle markers and wound up tied with Barbara for fastest shopping time.

Her bill was \$19.56, highest of the test. She bought some sale items, found the packaging information clear and helpful. In conversation with a Nation's Business editor she mentioned some of the recent innovations in food packaging. Among them: vegetables which come in a plastic bag that can be immersed in the cooking water.

Janet Redmon, another sophomore, is 16 and does all the food buying for her family. "I go every Friday," she said. "I like to do it; it's as much fun to me as going to a movie."

Janet spent \$18.25 and chose a variety of brands.

INFORMATION ADEQUATE

She is guided by name brands and the amount in a package. Package and label information? She finds it adequate. (When she took a can of plums from one shelf she carefully examined it to determine the water content.)

One of the items Janet bought was the "Big Bonus Box" of powder for an automatic dishwasher—"four extra ounces free."

What she likes most about shopping is "keeping up with all the new changes. I think they should always be thinking of new conveniences for the consumer. I say more power to them."

Carol Simpson, 16, is just starting the food phase of a home economics class in Yorktown High's 10th grade.

She spent \$15.45 and kept an eye peeled for good buys.

She does some of the family shopping and likes the variety offered in supermarkets.

She finds the package information helpful.

"Sometimes I'll check it closely, especially if I'm buying for a specific recipe."

Carol thinks brand, color, and appetizing pictures might influence her shopping choices, but she says that her mother's preferences probably have played a big role, too.

Any confusion?

"Only in locating a few items in the store."

To get a seller's-eye view of consumer savvy, Nation's Business interviewed personnel of the Kroger supermarket and other salespeople at supermarkets in the Washington, D.C., area.

WHAT THE SELLERS SAY

The portrait of the typical shopper drawn by these people hardly corresponds with that painted by those who are calling for more Federal regulation. Far from being timid, confused souls hopelessly adrift in "super-

marketland," most buyers, especially housewives, are a flinty band that surveys the newspaper food sections during the week and then descends on weekend supermarket sales with the determination of commandos hitting the beach, say sellers.

Some people, of course, are always going to be confused or misled by any system of competitive pricing and promotion.

But regulations by Uncle Sam or anyone else aren't likely to help this minority of shoppers, marketing experts make clear.

"They're getting shrewder all the time," said one supermarket manager, shaking his head. "They come through the door clutching bargain buys clipped from our newspaper ads and the specials from ads by all the other stores in the neighborhood."

This comparison of one store's offerings against another's is sometimes called cross-shopping in the trade. Buyers who carefully note only the bargain sales and then systematically pick them off in one market after another are sometimes known more irreverently as gravediggers.

SHARP SHOPPERS

At Arlington's Kroger supermarket, meat department manager Jack Linkenhoker tells of finding a shopping list that had been dropped by mistake into a display of packaged hamburger. On the list the shopper had scribbled all the sale items being offered that day by five different stores. "People are sharp," says Mr. Linkenhoker. "They know what they want."

Walter P. Margulies, president of Lippen-cott & Margulies, Inc., a New York industrial design firm, says: "Every day there is a nationwide vote taken by consumers in the supermarket and other stores."

"They vote for the products they select and buy. If they find they've been cheated, they never buy that product again."

"This is a much more effective form of regulation than anything the Government could set up. People have a great variety of likes, needs, and notions. They don't want to go back to the era when they could have any color car they wanted as long as it was black."

Some of the dangers of Federal regulation are pointed out by designer William Snaith, president of Raymond Loewy-William Snaith, Inc.

To define the individual character of a product and make sure the consumer understands its qualitative difference when compared with similar products, the container industry has in recent years "engaged in increasingly ingenious, economical, and convenient container shape developments," Mr. Snaith says.

"The consumer doesn't buy a 'quantity' in itself, but rather the benefits obtained through the very special, different characteristics of a product. Anything that can be done to project this difference in terms of package shape, appearance, and function is of benefit."

"The proposed legislation will, in effect, deny the consumer this important additional aid in making an educated selection. It will tend to encourage an increasing degree of package uniformity which will effectively disguise important differences in character, taste, performance and convenience between different products competing in the same general area."

WHAT OTHER STUDENTS SAID

After the supermarket experiment, Nation's Business interviewed 28 other Yorktown High School students, asking them to answer in writing such questions as these:

How much experience have you had in supermarket shopping?

What is it you like most about shopping? What do you like least?

Do you ever find yourself confused when you are in a supermarket or ordinary grocery store? If so, what is it that confuses you?

Do the packages, cans and other containers displayed tell you what you want to know about the products?

The young people who answered the questionnaire are all taking home economics. They range in age from 15 to 17. Most of them have shopped in supermarkets and several indicated they do the regular buying for their families. Most reported that they enjoy shopping. Adverse comments centered largely on time spent waiting in checkout lines and the hustle-bustle of aisles crowded with shopping carts.

Reaction to packaging information was generally favorable. Few reported any difficulty in understanding information on labels, though there were several who suggested that more food processors include information as to number of servings. Said one 16-year-old: "I like to shop because practically all of your needs are displayed by one company or another and the conveniences of the modern supermarkets are most helpful."

Many young homemakers in the United States today have had special training in purchasing. Nationally, an estimated two and a half million teenagers are enrolled in junior and senior home economics courses. Many of these courses include specific instruction on how to shop intelligently for clothing and food items.

In Arlington, according to home economics supervisor, Katherine R. Conafay, the food instruction gets into such details as how to vary menus, how to read labels, how to differentiate package sizes, quality and quantity.

Companies in the food and clothing industries make mountains of information on their products available to teachers of home economics. Some of this information is, in turn, passed on by the teachers to their students. Some of it is specifically designed to help young people make intelligent purchases, regardless of brand.

The availability of such literature (many States also publish consumer aids) is a factor which merits noting in the present controversy over the consumer.

Most people agree that business must fairly and clearly identify its products. Arguments arise over how well this is now being done. Groups and individuals who oppose more Federal regulation argue that existing laws and industry practices have produced packaging that is both honest and understandable.

LET'S KEEP POLITICS OUT OF THE PANTRY

(By Charles G. Mortimer, chairman, General Foods Corp.)

The typical American housewife is intelligent, experienced, and better informed about running a home than her counterpart in any preceding generation. Let's call her Mary Jones. Right now, she's shopping at her favorite supermarket. Because it, too, is typical, its shelves are lined with some 8,000 different items. Yet Mary Jones knows just what she wants, and she gets it. Into her cart go the prepackaged meats, quick-frozen vegetables, canned soups, frozen juice concentrates, prepared cake mixes, heat-and-serve rolls and all the other good things the Jones family will have served up to them at their dining room table in the week to come.

As she leaves the supermarket, Mary Jones takes it for granted that what she has bought is the purest, most nutritious, easiest-to-prepare food the world has ever seen. Having spent 40 years in the food business, I can attest to the fact that her assumption is correct and, what's more, that the prices she has paid are the most reasonable to be found anywhere on earth.

But what Mary Jones probably does not know—and what disturbs me deeply—is that the machinery of free competition which has made ours the best fed nation on earth is in danger of being tampered with. It is

Frank J. O'Neill, Anchorage; Bernice Jordan, Anchorage; Florence C. Brown, Anchorage; Mr. W. C. Duehah, Anchorage; Mrs. Fannie Masduchari, Anchorage; Mary D. Totten, Anchorage; Irene E. Ryan, Anchorage; John E. Ryan, Anchorage; Jerome Murphy Jr., Anchorage; Neill Caffel, Anchorage; Laura O'Malley, Anchorage; Tracy Bushue, Anchorage; Peggy O'Malley, Anchorage; Danna Povich, Anchorage; William Van Alen, Anchorage; Juanita Runestad, Anchorage; Jewel Berger, Anchorage; Grace Ormand, Spenard; Will Sceryard, Anchorage; W. Allen, Anchorage; John Bedford, Anchorage; Katrina Stenorov, Anchorage; Bill Smith, Anchorage; Mary P. Brudie and children, Anchorage;

Eddie Berkley, Anchorage; James Vesterfelt, Anchorage; S. Walker, Cincinnati, Ohio; Robert Patterson, Anchorage; Harry E. Bates, Elmendorf, A.F.B., Alaska; Ann Brown, Anchorage, Alaska; Mattie McGuire, Anchorage, Alaska; Alvin F. Browder, Clinton, Alaska; Phyllis Argo, Spenard; Janie Yearley, Rhonda; Hattie Mae Baines; Mrs. Toby Gamble, Anchorage; Toby Gamble, Anchorage; Donald W. Holton, Anchorage; Corinne Jones, Anchorage; S. Armand Michell; David M. Sims, Shiloh Baptist Church; Rodney I. Burton, Shiloh Baptist Church; Margaret Burton, Shiloh Baptist Church; D. S. Osbourne; James T. Smith, Anchorage; Albert T. Martin, Anchorage; Alan Merson, Unitarian Fellowship; Bessie M. Youngblood; Mrs. Betty Lou (Charles) Stevens, Anchorage; Charles Stevens, Anchorage; Shelby J. Fall, Anchorage; Harriett C. Jones, Anchorage; Clarence O. Coleman, Anchorage; Mervis Bowman, Spenard; Annie P. Zimmerman;

Fred Zimmerman, Anchorage; Claude A. Mitchell, U.S.A.F.; Leo A. Josey, Sr.; Rev. B. E. Rodgers; Merlyn M. Runestad, Anchorage; Mary E. Hall, Fairbanks; Richard E. Hall, Fairbanks; Emma Stokes; Pink Stokes; Mrs. E. L. Berkley, Anchorage; Cammie L. Watkins; Jesse L. Jones; Kermit L. Matthews; Bennie B. Burton; E. M. Johnson; John L. Maakestad, Anchorage; Bill M. Lark; Cora Bogan, Anchorage, Alaska; Antoinette Chubb, Anchorage; Alice S. Green, Anchorage; Marie Murray; Lois Simon; Greg Simon; Anne M. Lockhart, Anchorage; Parnell Lockhart, Anchorage; Jessie Lockhart; Marian Lenys; Rufie Payne, Spenard; Nathaniel Leale; James Walker, Elmendorf; Shirley Cody, Anchorage.

Edward H. Smith, Anchorage; Mrs. Ollie E. Smith, Anchorage, Alaska; Bill Maden, Anchorage; Pat Coleman; Rev. Clarence W. Davis; Ernestine Burdette, Anchorage; Robert J. Davis, Sr.; Louis G. Howard; Bessie Higgins; Les Campbell; H. C. Wiley; R. C. McFarland; J. Smith; T. E. Jarman, Elmendorf; H. Jackson, Elmendorf; J. L. Clark; E. E. Clark; Linda Lake; Dennis P. P. Lee; L. Anderson; Jean Haine, Anchorage; Katie M. Bates, Anchorage; E. A. Kennedy, Anchorage; Mr. and Mrs. Dan Hawkins; Nellie Harrison, Anchorage; Percy B. Bell, Seattle, Wash.; Eva Duncan, Anchorage; Abraham Hopen; Eddie Hawkins, Anchorage; Ida Mae Patterson, Anchorage; Mike Fresh, Anchorage, Alaska.

Arthur Nukline; Laura O. Joyce, Anchorage; George M. Parkko, Anchorage; Indz M. Parkko, Anchorage; Roscoe Batte, Anchorage; June Robinette; Laura M. Adams, Metlakatla, Alaska; Wm. Adams, Metlakatla, Alaska; Thomas J. Walkee, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs.

Henry Burton; Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Hancock, Anchorage, Alaska; Mr. and Mrs. Merrill Gilmore, Anchorage; Mr. Ella Goldin, Spenard, Alaska; Louis G. Howard, Anchorage; Rev. J. L. Steward, Anchorage; Mr. and Mrs. John C. Kelly, Anchorage; Sjlady S. Funkhouser, Anchorage; Walter L. Wathe; Mrs. Martha Fair; Mrs. David Ruskin, Anchorage; Herbert D. Soll, Anchorage; Patricia Soll, Anchorage; Cecil J. Lewis, Elmendorf; Cleosta L. Lewis, Elmendorf; Jacqueline N. Sewell, Spenard; Norman Burnside, Fort Rise; John A. Murray, Harrison.

Kathleen Owens; Robert E. Massy; Mrs. Robert E. Massy; Mrs. L. H. Johnston, Jr.; L. H. Johnston, Jr.; E. S. Lott, Helen W. Thomas; Nancy H. Rice; Alberta Pennywell; Edna Rifter, Mrs. Carroll Colvin; Mrs. Kittie Cherry; James Stewart; Willie Edward; Carl M. Henderson; Inez Buxton; David M. Sims; Blanche G. Brown; E. R. McDonnell; Mickey McLaughlin; Thomas J. Moore; R. C. McFarland; Mr. O. F. Agee; Greg Simon; Cora Bogan; Peter Delduke; Mrs. Future M. Walton. J. O. Rice; James Parker, Jr., Elmendorf AFB; Henry Atkins, Jr., Elmendorf AFB; Ronald L. Moore; Leroy J. Smith, EAFB; M. E. Reese, Anchorage; Roberta Smith, Anchorage; Gregory W. Govan, Anchorage; Herbert J. Turner, EAFB; Russell L. Flood, EAFB; Arlin G. Rose, Anchorage, Alaska; Lillie M. Wright, Anchorage, Alaska.

EXHIBIT 2

THERE ARE SOME THINGS WORTH MARCHING FOR

Why hold a civil rights march in Anchorage? Why not?

Are the people of Anchorage any less concerned with or involved in the current struggle for individual liberty in the United States than Americans elsewhere?

There were no "incidents" during yesterday's march. But in the days preceding it many had questioned the wisdom of holding such a demonstration.

The day is long past due when we should consider what is taking place in Alabama or Mississippi or elsewhere in the United States as local disturbances.

There are more Negroes in Selma, Ala., than whites. Yet the white voters of Selma outnumbered the Negroes more than 90 to 1. The power of the State, enforced through local government, has been used to deny American citizens the right to vote. Two weeks ago, Alabama State troopers beat and tear gassed unarmed men, women, and children. They did so with the full authority of the State behind them.

Is this a local problem? Does a State have the right to strip from some of its people rights and protections guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States? Certainly not. The Governor of Alabama, in taking the oath of office swore to uphold the U.S. Constitution as well as that of the State of Alabama.

That is why people marched in Alaska yesterday. They wanted to demonstrate their concern. They wanted to express the conscience of America. They wanted to pay tribute to some people who have died so senselessly in a battle that should have been decided within our Nation's boundaries a century ago.

What is taking place today is not an Alabama problem. It is not a southern problem. It is a problem—and concern—of free men protesting State-imposed injustice.

As the director of the Anchorage Council of Churches so clearly put it yesterday, we march to call attention to Memorial Day and St. Patrick's Day and Fur Rendezvous. Who can seriously object to men marching in favor of human rights?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. GRUENING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—VIII

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the news from Vietnam continues to be highly disturbing but not unexpected in view of the facts underlying our engagement in that area.

The Washington Post for March 27, 1965, contained a story from Saigon by Jack Foiese which begins as follows:

The United States is rapidly reaching the day it must ask South Vietnam to surrender some of its sovereignty—at least temporarily.

Little by little the facade surrounding our involvement in South Vietnam crumbles.

First we clung to the fabrication that our military men were in South Vietnam only as "advisers" teaching the South Vietnamese how to fight a jungle war. But little by little that fabrication eroded until it became apparent that our advisers were frontline troops. With the air strikes into North Vietnam by U.S. planes, manned solely by U.S. military personnel, the truth stood out plainly for all to see.

We have repeatedly stated that the United States is militarily involved in South Vietnam only at the specific request of the duly constituted South Vietnamese Government. Mr. Foiese's article indicates that we may soon "go it alone" and take over the war in the new role as a "cobelligerent." This certainly means we are coming out into the open.

For 2 months now we have steadily escalated the war in Vietnam, carrying our air strikes into North Vietnam.

As the New York Times put it in its lead editorial entitled "Something More Than Bombs" on March 28, 1965:

Military pressure alone—which implies a demand for unconditional surrender—is unlikely to win the balance in the Hanoi leadership toward a negotiated settlement. Positive American proposals, which suggest a way out and a viable future for North Vietnam, are the essential complement.

The time has long since passed for rethinking our position in Vietnam. The continued escalation of the war in Vietnam—carrying the war further and further into North Vietnam—can only have disastrous consequences for the world.

Unbiased observers of the scene have repeatedly pointed out that the war in Vietnam can be settled only by political means. It is a political struggle which we have erroneously assumed could be settled by bombs alone.

It is a basic struggle of South Vietnamese against South Vietnamese. One side is aided by men and weapons from the United States. The other side is aided by men and weapons from North

Vietnam. But, as has also been repeatedly pointed out, while the Vietcong are aided and advised by Hanoi, that does not, necessarily mean that Hanoi can press a button and cause the Vietcong to desist from their fight to gain control over South Vietnam. Even if Hanoi agreed to stop aiding the Vietcong, the latter would still continue to fight even as many of the South Vietnamese whom we are aiding would continue to fight if we withdrew every fighting man and every last piece of U.S. military equipment.

I have long proposed that the war in Vietnam be brought to the conference table. That will inevitably be done—why not now?

Without adequately explaining our ultimate aims, we have escalated the war by air strikes into North Vietnam.

Do we seek the overthrow of the government of Hanoi? Our actions seem to indicate this.

Do we seek to destroy and conquer all of North Vietnam? Our actions seem to indicate this.

We have ignored the proffers of intercession by the Pope, the Secretary General of the United Nations and others—all of whom have counseled against further escalation of this conflict. We should promptly accept one of these offers of assistance to arrange for an immediate cease-fire in all of Vietnam. Once the shooting has ceased—once men are no longer being killed and maimed—we should offer to negotiate the issues and to arrange for supervised elections in Vietnam, offering the people of Vietnam at those elections the various choices open to them as to the type of government they desire.

The image of the United States has become badly tarnished in the past months. We should work as hard as we can to regain our position in the world as a peace-loving, peace-seeking nation. Our present posture as a war-seeking nation is not at all in keeping with the will of our own people. We should change that posture and change it now.

In his article yesterday in the New York Times entitled "The Taylor Mission on Vietnam," Mr. James Reston stated:

The President's decision to bomb North Vietnam has not achieved its objective. It has not persuaded the Communists to stop their infiltration and military subversion in South Vietnam. It has committed the prestige and power of the United States in a war against the North Vietnamese Communists without success, and the question now is whether to increase the pressure or withdraw.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story by Mr. Jack Folsie in the Washington Post for March 27, 1965, and the editorial entitled "Something More Than Bombs", and the James Reston column entitled "The Taylor Mission on Vietnam" in the New York Times for March 28, 1965, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 27, 1965]

UNITED STATES MAY ASK SOUTH VIETNAM TO GIVE UP SOME SOVEREIGNTY

(By Jack Folsie)

SAIGON.—The United States is rapidly reaching the day it must ask South Vietnam to surrender some of its sovereignty—at least temporarily.

America's involvement here is becoming too substantial for its representatives to remain junior partners in all aspects of the conduct of the war. As American troop strength continues to grow, and it now includes combat troops such as the Marines at Da Nang Air Base, the need will increase for American command of the operations to which they are committed.

This will involve not only direction of U.S. units but some higher command positions, it was learned. Eventually, the Vietnamese may remain supreme only at the very highest staff levels, where grand strategy is made and where American advice is needed.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and others in the Pentagon prefer to say that American units now here are not committed to combat. But, as a matter of fact, the rule of shoot only when shot at has gone out the window.

The 4,000 marines of the 9th Expeditionary Brigade are guarding the Da Nang Base—but they are doing so in the most aggressive way possible, for that is their order.

In theory their orders come from the Vietnamese joint general staff. But actually they come from Gen. William Westmoreland, America's four-star adviser in Vietnam.

The next step is to formalize this chain of command. It will provide the fast reaction time the marines may need someday.

Many in the Vietnamese hierarchy understand that the United States has become a belligerent with the right to demand the command of American troops. In some cases, Americans will command Vietnamese units as well.

The war is about at that stage.

The United States already has assumed virtual command of the air war. It is an open secret that for months American-flown Skyraiders have been as active as Vietnamese Skyraiders in strikes against the Vietcong. In a recent meeting with correspondents, an Air Force spokesman admitted this.

Since American jets went into action against Vietcong targets a few weeks ago, the need for quick decisions and coordination found the Vietnamese unready for sophisticated air operations. So the Americans took over to plan and execute jet bombing strikes.

Occasionally there are ruffled feelings. A Vietnamese unit commander may want a strike to soften up the enemy. The American adviser overrules him, saying the target is not suitable. But generally the new relationship is being worked out very well at the field level. The same accord at the staff level is yet to come.

The American mission here also needs to ask the Vietnamese to surrender sovereignty in another field—censorship of foreign press reports. There is none now. But an American meeting of high government press officers last week considered the adoption of such press censorship.

The immediate block to such a plan is the Vietnamese Government. Its censorship of Vietnamese newspapers is severe and is imposed on political as well as military grounds.

The American involvement, and the predominance of U.S. reporters on the scene, has caused our own military to provide press facilities and assistance.

Can the American command talk the Vietnamese into letting the Americans censor their own press?

If the government of Prime Minister Pha Huy Quat agrees, it represents another crack in the sovereignty which the prideful Vietnamese regard so highly.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

SOMETHING MORE THAN BOMBS

The limited American air war against North Vietnam is now entering its eighth week. It is not too soon to ask what it has accomplished—and why it has not accomplished more.

The aim of the continuing air offensive accompanied by threats of further escalation, was to persuade the North Vietnamese Communists to halt their armed infiltration into South Vietnam. When it was under taken, one of President Johnson's highest advisers predicted privately that the Communists' will to fight would be weakened in 2 months. So far, there is no indication that he was right; on the contrary, there clearly has been a stiffening of Communist positions, as Secretary Rusk has admitted.

The Soviet Union has announced that arms aid is on its way to North Vietnam. More important, a direct Soviet-American confrontation in southeast Asia through the use of Soviet "volunteers" in North Vietnam has been publicly threatened by the top Soviet leader, Communist Party First Secretary Brezhnev.

The Vietnamese and Chinese Communists have stiffened their positions even more. Hanoi, which a few weeks ago privately indicated agreement to French and United Nations proposals of negotiations—while refusing a cease-fire—now rejects such proposals. Backed by Moscow, the North Vietnamese insist that there can be no talks while American bombing continues. Peiping has taken the most extreme position of all. It insists there can be no negotiations before the "complete, unconditional" withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. The Vietcong, which shows some signs of independence from Hanoi, has enthusiastically adopted the Peiping line.

Meanwhile, the American bombing—not to mention use of nonlethal gas—has significantly alienated world opinion. Concern about the danger of a major war is wide spread. Equally important, there is profound puzzlement about Washington's objectives and tactics.

The trouble is that President Johnson, master of domestic politics, had until last week seemed to forget that war is politics too, even if pursued by "other means." He launched a military offensive, but neglected his diplomatic offensive.

Now the President has promised American aid for "wider and bolder programs" of regional economic development benefiting all of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam. Despite its vague terms, this promise indicates that Washington is beginning to face up to the need to offer its opponents in southeast Asia a diplomatic, political, and economic exit from the military cul-de-sac in which we as well as they are now entrapped.

Persuasive peace proposals can be a political weapon not only toward world opinion, at a time when Americans are bombing Asians but in presenting moderate Communists with an alternative they can support within the Communist camp. That camp is divided, not only along national lines but within each national capital. And nowhere are the divisions more critical than in Hanoi.

Neither the Vietcong nor the Chinese Communists can be swayed by the bombing of North Vietnam, which causes them no direct

ain. They are pressing to intensify the war. The Vietcong, particularly, has made major military gains in recent months and sees very successive Saigon coup as another nail in the coffin of its enemies. It will not be easy for Hanoi, in these circumstances, to shift course and seek a negotiated settlement, even with Soviet backing.

Military pressure alone—which implies a demand for unconditional surrender—is unlikely to swing the balance in the Hanoi leadership toward a negotiated settlement. Positive American proposals, which suggest a way out and a viable future for North Vietnam, are the essential complement.

President Johnson's statement last week could be the precursor of proposals offering Hanoi, once peace is restored, access to the rice of South Vietnam, trade with the West, an end of the embargo and diplomatic boycott that Washington and Saigon have imposed since 1954, and entry to international development assistance. Area development schemes covering the entire Mekong Valley could be pushed. These, linked with concrete proposals for negotiations and firm offers of a phased American withdrawal from South Vietnam in accordance with the Geneva agreements, could not fail to influence events.

An immediate Communist response might not be forthcoming. But the words would be heard both within the Communist regimes and outside. World opinion would be rallied. That support will be needed, especially if the war in Vietnam is about to enter a new and more virulent phase.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE TAYLOR MISSION ON VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—In the next few days, President Johnson will go through another critical review of his policy on Vietnam. It is one of those moments in history when the decisions taken by a few men here in Washington could have a profound effect on the history of the next generation.

The immediate question is clear enough. The President's decision to bomb North Vietnam has not achieved its objective. It has not persuaded the Communists to stop their infiltration and military subversion in South Vietnam. It has committed the prestige and power of the United States in a war against the North Vietnamese Communists, without success, and the question now is whether to increase the pressure or withdraw.

THE RECALL OF TAYLOR

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the U.S. Ambassador in Saigon, and former head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, has been brought home to participate in the decision. He will be in consultation here next week on a number of critical questions. Should the United States begin attacking the transportation system—the bridges and tunnels on the railroads closer and closer to the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi? Should the U.S. bombers go farther north to destroy the new North Vietnamese industries around Hanoi and Haiphong?

If such raids bring the American bombers into the range of the North Vietnamese MiG fighters, should the United States attack the bases from which these bombers come north of Hanoi and even in South China?

General Taylor's mission to Washington is described officially as "routine," but there is nothing "routine" about the decisions to be made, for they involve the risk of war with China which controls one-quarter of the world's people.

In the face of this difficult situation there has been a lot of talk about the wisdom of negotiating a compromise settlement over

Vietnam, but the capitals of the world have little encouraging information.

The British explored the prospect of a Vietnamese settlement with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko in London, but he brushed them off. The administration has made many more private inquiries about a negotiated settlement than it cares to admit, but these have been rebuffed.

President Johnson has been in touch with Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson of Canada, who has a representative on the International Control Commission in Vietnam, on the prospect of useful negotiation; but Mr. Pearson has had to report to the President that the North Vietnamese are not interested, at least for the present.

Even the French, who have been leading the campaign for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, concede privately that they received no encouragement either in Hanoi, or in Peiping.

The issue, therefore, is not whether President Johnson is ready for negotiations. The North Vietnamese Communists have been rejecting a negotiated settlement for months.

As long ago as last July the North Vietnamese official daily newspaper Hoc Tap said:

"The liberation of South Vietnam can be settled only by force. To that end it is necessary to smash the reactionary administrative machinery and the imperialists' mercenary army. This revolution can and should be decided only by revolutionary action, using the force of the masses to defeat the enemy forces; it cannot be settled by treaties and agreements."

COMPLICATED ISSUE

The issue before the President and his associates, including General Taylor, is therefore much more complicated than the national argument about negotiations would make it seem. In fact, the North Vietnamese insist on seeing the struggle as a test of the cold war all over the world.

For example, North Vietnam's Premier Pham Van Dong recently was quoted in a Hanoi newspaper as follows:

"With rudimentary equipment, the population of South Vietnam is victoriously fighting the U.S. imperialists armed with the most modern weapons. This experience of our compatriots in South Vietnam attracts the attention of the world, especially the peoples in South America. Our South Vietnamese citizens are teaching other peoples that they are certainly capable of defeating the U.S. imperialists and can rely on their own strength to liberate themselves."

GENERAL GIAP'S VIEWS

The leader of the North Vietnamese Communist army, General Giap, has been even more specific. He is the man who defeated the French army in Vietnam in the fifties, with a loss of 176,000 French casualties. He recently commented:

"South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time * * *. If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, this means that it can be defeated everywhere in the world."

On this point, incidentally, the Johnson administration tends to agree. They see the war in Vietnam as a critical test of the Communist technique of military subversion, which must be defeated now or faced in many other places in the world, including the Western Hemisphere. This is what the return of General Taylor is all about. The bombing of North Vietnam is not achieving its objectives. The Communist attack on South Vietnam is not subsiding. So new decisions have to be made in the next few days, and they may be among the most important political and military decisions since the last world war.

MEETING OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, March 17, 1965, by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

The organizational meeting of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was held at 10 a.m. on March 17, 1965, in the old Supreme Court chambers of the Capitol Building. All members of the committee were present.

Motion was duly made, seconded and unanimously adopted that Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY be elected chairman to represent the Senate membership of the joint committee. Motion was duly made, seconded and unanimously adopted that Congressman RAY MADDEN be elected chairman to represent the Members of the House of Representatives on the joint committee. Senator MONRONEY and Congressman MADDEN shall act as co-chairman for purposes of conduct of subsequent committee meetings, committee hearings and the like.

It was called to the attention of the joint committee that under the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a chairman must be designated for the committee for purposes of handling disbursements from the Senate contingency fund and other administrative matters. On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously adopted, Senator MONRONEY was elected chairman of the joint committee for these purposes and Congressman RAY MADDEN was elected vice chairman to act as co-chairman of the committee.

The committee then discussed staffing requirements and the necessity of obtaining office space for the staff and space for subsequent committee hearings and meetings. Senator CLIFFORD CASE and Congressman JACK BROOKS were appointed a subcommittee to obtain space for these purposes.

It was agreed that the cochairman of the committee would call another committee meeting and recommend an agenda for hearings and committee work after the staff had been selected.

The cochairmen of the committee were authorized to insert the minutes of the organizational meeting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as notice of the formation of the committee and the appointment of officers as set forth herein.

There being no further business to come before the committee, it was on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

A. S. MIKE MONRONEY,
Cochairman.
RAY J. MADDEN,
Cochairman.
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Acting Secretary.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AT NOON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next, at noon.

March 29, 1965

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, April 1, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 29, 1965:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Walker E. Morris, Cherokee.
L. D. Stapp, Epes.

ALASKA

Lester Suvlu, Barrow.

ARKANSAS

Dee R. Robbins, Norman.

CALIFORNIA

Patrick F. Chevreau, Elverta.
Frank J. Noll, Madera.
Gerald J. Stephens, Stirling City.
Mary E. Rogers, Summit City.
Thomas J. McCaffrey, Vallejo.

CONNECTICUT

Wilfred O. Racicot, Dayville.

DELAWARE

Albert B. Carter, Camden-Wyoming.
Alfred R. Smith, Greenwood.

FLORIDA

Robert H. Wetzel, Sr., Babson Park.
Philip A. Crannell, Titusville.

GEORGIA

Jack B. Smith, East Point.
Lillie T. Boswell, Greensboro.
Edward P. Anderson, Grovetown.
Lowell D. Morgan, Springfield.
Ralph C. Martin, Uvalda.

ILLINOIS

Walter J. Malackowski, Calumet City.
Stanley H. Cowan, Dundee.
John B. Reis, Fairbury.
Robert T. Elgin, Fairmount.
Maurine C. Brown, Gardner.
William L. Parker, Genoa.
Harold L. Morrison, Hoopeston.
William F. Knobbs, La Harpe.
George B. Murphy, Odin.
Edward A. Schroeder, Pekin.
Roman J. Mazurowski, Tinley Park.
Glenard E. Miller, Willow Hill.

INDIANA

Harold L. Shepard, La Porte.
Rex L. Tobias, Warren.
Stanley P. Switt, Westville.

IOWA

Evelyn P. Lupkes, Kesley.
Wallace L. Sheehy, Lawler.
Lawrence G. Phillips, Stratford.

KANSAS

Willena J. Martin, Chase.
Raleigh J. May, Haven.
Loyd L. Baughman, Longton.
Paul W. Wade, Mayfield.
Charles H. Seller, Mulvane.
Earl D. Medlen, Rantoul.
Myron L. Van Gundy, Reading.
Robert A. Franken, Troy.

KENTUCKY

Bobbie T. Hunter, Providence.
James P. Edwards, Russellville.
Doris K. Burns, Sanders.

LOUISIANA

Roger Frere, Madisonville.
Henry L. Parham, Mangham.

MARYLAND

Albert A. Phillips, Hampstead.
Margaret A. Stotler, Hancock.
Hilda B. Free, New Market.
Nicholas S. Price, Sparks.
Thomas H. Wallace, Street.
Evelyn F. Lednum, Tilghman.

MASSACHUSETTS

Frank Zalot, Jr., Hadley.
James I. Keyes, Sharon.
Lawrence B. Connelly, Sherborn.
John J. Kelley, Jr., Truro.

MICHIGAN

Robert L. Hunsberger, Bloomingdale.
Kenneth G. Kienitz, Ithaca.
James M. Stubbett, Mason.
Theodore Russ, New Buffalo.
John L. May, Paris.
George E. Smith, Sand Lake.
Gerald A. Farnan, Shepherd.
Donald F. Gillard, Spruce.

MINNESOTA

Hjalmar Hulin, Aitkin.
Michel C. Rooney, Benson.
Marcellus J. Simonson, Wood Lake.

MISSOURI

Emmet R. Carey, Brookfield.
Wilson S. Tally, Clinton.
Robert F. Reddick, Crystal City.
Janet K. Lewis, Des Arc.
Edward C. Grimes, Gallatin.
Martha F. Mead, Harrisburg.
Thomas G. Williams, Lathrop.
Robert W. Burford, Leeton.
V. Wayne Shroyer, Mercer.
Don O. Baker, Newburg.
William J. Blanton, Norwood.
George T. Lipscomb, Wellsville.

NEBRASKA

Ella E. Jackson, Crookston.
Robert D. Nealon, Wolbach.

NEW JERSEY

Jeanne L. Tamplin, Hewitt.
Warren T. Moulton, Rahway.

NEW YORK

Philip J. Dittmeier, Manorville.
Francis P. Secor, Otego.
Louis P. Kriss, West Islip.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard Young, Bakersville.
Paul E. Buck, Burnsville.
Ann F. Watts, Germantown.
Anne B. Collins, Laurel Springs.
Elma P. Drew, Magnolia.
Mildred A. Crowder, Peachland.
James W. Jenkins, Pendleton.
Sybil M. Biconish, White Oak.

NORTH DAKOTA

Thelma A. Hovet, Buxton.

OHIO

Miles S. Snyder, Jr., Brookfield.
Thomas R. Armstrong, Mendon.
Thelma M. Schneider, Middle Bass.
C. Thomas Sharp, Pleasant Plain.
Harold W. Kinney, Richmond.

OKLAHOMA

Ruth M. Phillips, Gore.
Beatrice H. Jones, Porter.

OREGON

Mabel E. Pounds, Adrian.
Max E. Gardner, Springfield.
Lavonne H. Moe, Sweet Home.
Elizabeth A. Barber, Ukiah.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ernest E. Roberts, Bechtelsville.
Harry P. Snyder, Columbia.
Paul B. Robinson, Concordville.
Phares C. Cramer, Conestoga.
Arthur E. Smith, Crooked Creek.
Abram B. Lauver, Dalmatia.
Raymond G. Mathews, Doylestown.
Charles C. Kerlin, Falls.
Walter E. Lucas, Fleming.
Ruth L. Funk, Glenwillard.
Harvey A. Baddorf, Halifax.
James J. Kelly, Herminie.
Charles L. Gilmore, Lahaska.
William E. Nolan, Lake Ariel.
Herbert A. Hall, Lakewood.
Warren B. Stapleton, Lewisburg.
Edward B. Henning, Mehoopany.
Alice H. Bustin, Milan.
Ernestine C. Buttorff, Millmont.
Althea M. Best, Neffs.
Raymond E. Hausman, New Tripoli.
Norma A. Stoudt, Palm.
Ralph S. Meyer, Pocopson.
George Novak, Sayre.
Robert L. Clink, Snow Shoe.
Lloyd S. French, Starrucca.
Walter H. Hoffman, Strasburg.
Everett A. Holmes, Thompson.
Walter P. Quintin, Thornton.
George P. Kraft, Washington Boro.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Douglas E. McTeer, Early Branch.
Farrell E. Rodgers, New Ellenton.
John W. Rogers, Pelzer.
Vertie Lee Sallee, Sallee.
Milledge D. Penn, Ward.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leonard H. Nelson, Miller.

TENNESSEE

Joe F. Corlew, Bruceton.
Avos B. Halsell, Moss.

TEXAS

Sam A. Kelley, Alvarado.
Annie M. Whittley, Barksdale.
Edwin Zajick, Buckholts.
Robert L. Baldridge, Jr., Clifton.
Walter Kutzer, Comfort.
Evaline W. Bartlett, Glen Flora.
Leonard W. Pierce, Gordon.
Katherine B. Carter, Hawley.
Ramon G. Amaya, San Diego.
O. C. Sewell, Jr., Sulphur Springs.
Sammie O. Smith, Telephone.

VERMONT

Francis H. Eddy, East Wallingford.
James D. O'Brien, Shelburne.

VIRGINIA

Agnes M. Allen, Goshen.
Norman J. Hogge, Hayes.
Charles R. Jordan, Haymarket.
Stuart M. Petke, West Point.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles G. Robison, Fairview.
Glenn W. Hammer, Weston.
George A. Fahey, Wheeling.

WISCONSIN

Lawrence J. Vandehey, Aburndale.
Vernon A. Plamann, Greenville.

March 29, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300160009-3

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1491

Who is my brother?
He is the man who finds life good,
Who knows great joy
In man's response to faith and truth,
Who recognizes beauty in the meanest place
And seeks to share what he himself enjoys.
Who is my brother?
My brother is every man.

**Aid to Education: A Mandate From
the People**

**SPEECH
OF**

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to lend my support to the Elementary and Secondary School Education Act of 1965. With our expanding and growing economy, we must continue to improve the education of the American people. We must build more classrooms, improve the quality of teaching, and equalize educational opportunities for every American child.

The youth of our country is our most important national resource. As a nation we have a vital interest in their education. For this reason I fully support the goal which the Education Act seeks to attain—that of bringing better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most and to provide incentives for everyone who wants to learn.

I oppose across-the-board aid to private schools on constitutional grounds. I do favor categorical aids which in my opinion would not be unconstitutional. This bill does not violate the principle of separation of church and state. America has accepted her role as the defender of human liberty and democracy. Now we must realize the fullest educational potential of all American children—the underprivileged as well as the affluent—to strengthen our position as the defender of liberty and democracy.

Among the many telegrams and letters which I received urging my support of the education bill were the following telegrams from educational organizations and schools:

We urge full support of President Johnson's education bill. Urge opposition to any amendments and urge you to vote against recommitment.

WILLIAM RYNACK,
President Metropolitan Association of
Higher Education of the National
Education Association, Time and Life
Building, New York City.

The city teachers association of New York urges you to vote in favor of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (H.R. 2362) in its present form.

We implore you to vote against any efforts to amend or recommit (H.R. 2362).

HARRY VANHOUTEN,
Executive Director City Teachers Association of New York, Time Life Building, New York City.

Please be advised that the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO voted in February to support President Johnson's elementary and secondary school program. In support of this position, our union is now conducting a nationwide referendum.

CHARLES COGEN,
President American Federation of Teachers.

We appreciate the courtesy shown to our representatives by you and your office last week. We are happy that House Education and Labor Committee approved H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We urge your full support to H.R. 2362 as approved by the committee. This is a good education bill and should be passed by the House now.

CLAYTON E. ROSE,
New York State Teachers Association.

As chairman of the Hewlett Woodmere Teachers Association I urge that you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Vote against any motion to recommit. Vote for and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

JOEL RINDLER,
Hewlett High School, Hewlett, N.Y.

That you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Vote against any motion to recommit. Vote for and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

NICHOLAS A. GIROLAMO,
Chairman, Federal Legislative Committee, South Nassau Zone Teachers Association, Forest Lake School, Wantagh, N.Y.

As chairman of the Valley Stream North High School Faculty Association, I urge that you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; vote against any motion to recommit; vote for, and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

ALPHONSE P. MAYERNIK,
Valley Stream North High School.

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America has gone on record in favor of President Johnson's bill providing for Federal aid in education opportunity for America's underprivileged children, regardless of whether they attend public or religion-sponsored schools.

MOSES I. FEUERSTEIN,
National President, The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Entire Orthodox Jewish community deeply opposed to any amendments to education aid bill especially judicial review amendment which would torpedo every possibility of bills hoped for enactment. Strongly urge you to vote against judicial review and other crippling amendments for which you will earn our deep gratitude.

RABBI MORRIS SHERER,
Agudath Israel of America.

Hatch Act Liberalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, a new publication, the Federal Times, contains an editorial in the March 10 edition about liberalization of the Pernicious Political Activities Act, otherwise known as the Hatch Act. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4959, to strike out the restrictive passages of the act and allow Government employees to play active political roles.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would not open a floodgate of political activity by Government employees. It would be a sense of Congress measure under which the Civil Service Commission and other Federal agencies could relax restrictions.

More civic and political leaders are realizing every day that certain restrictive provisions of the Hatch Act are keeping Government employees in a sort of iron maiden in which they are penalized if they move in any direction.

The increasing number of nonpartisan political groups can be directly attributed to the Hatch Act. This is causing a situation in the Washington area which is almost unique in the United States. We in Congress and the man in the White House exemplify the highest traditions of partisan politics. Yet, not 5 miles away in the Washington suburbs, we are being surrounded by political jurisdictions replete with nonpartisan political parties composed mostly of Government employees which have been "hatched" from the two-party system. I submit that this ridiculous situation must be changed.

With this in mind, I offer the following editorial from the Federal Times:

RESTRICTION OR PROTECTION?

Several proposals have been made to amend or repeal the Hatch Act. This is the 1939 law which bans partisan political activity or campaign participation by Government workers.

One proposal would ease the restrictions, thus permitting employees to engage in political activity within limits set by their agencies. The other would eliminate all restrictions.

Any plan which expands the freedom of action for individuals is welcome. However, Government employees need to realize that complete freedom has its price.

The Post Office currently has a mailbag full of trouble as it investigates charges of political pressure during fund solicitations in the recent campaign.

The complaints are based on charges that postal regional offices designated one man to receive campaign contributions. The money reportedly was collected from postmasters and mail carriers. Funds raised were then said to have been channeled to political candidates.

This is the second investigation of a Hatch violation during the last election. The first case dealt with sale of \$100 tickets to the Democratic gala by officials in the Rural Electrification Administration. Investigation

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300160009-3

March 29, 1965

A1492

on this has been completed but no findings have been announced.

It is easy to conjure up the problems that could arise if all restrictions on political activity of Government employees were removed.

A request for a political contribution would be difficult to refuse—if the request came from the boss. A flood of propaganda leaflets could pile up on desks. Briefing sessions could turn into political rallies as partisan presentations colored the reporting of facts.

Whether the problems envisioned ever would develop is an academic question. The point to be made is this: If the Hatch Act is to be modified, then guidelines must be clearly established to insure that the new freedom granted will not destroy the protection provided under the old rules.

Joseph McCaffrey Commentary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 4, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, murder is an appalling act no matter where it occurs, on Route 80 in Alabama or on the streets of Pittsburgh, my own city. One is sometimes tempted to believe that it is a less shocking act today for many people than it was only a decade ago. But are we really so hardened to violence?

Joseph McCaffrey spoke about this last Friday evening in a very perceptive WMAL-TV broadcast. I think his words should be carefully read and pondered by all Americans.

JOSEPH McCaffrey COMMENTARY,
WMAL-TV, MARCH 26, 1965

We have learned nothing since the murder on November 22, 1963.

It is almost as if we have adopted violence as a way of life here in the United States.

It may be that our population of almost 200 million people has precluded us from abiding by that old philosophy of "live and let live" * * * we can't seem to adjust to living in close proximity with our neighbors.

That is, if our neighbor is not an exact copy of ourselves.

The recent violent deaths in Alabama indicate that we want those copies to think as we do, too. It is not enough that they be of our own color—they must also have our prejudices and our hatreds.

Peace on earth to men of good will.

But men of good will seem to be harder to find these days. It may be that television contributes to this blood thirst we are now witnessing.

If the Old West was as it is portrayed on television, today the West would have undertakers as the wealthiest men, and the States of the West would be populated with gun-toting idiots.

But the Old West wasn't like that. The winners were the men who could think and did think—the gun slingers were on the periphery.

Yet today we dignify them, via television, as the men who won the West. If the West had depended on them for its development, it would be as barren today as the moon.

Our heritage from the Old West was the cooperation of neighbor with neighbor, with help in return for help, and with a respect for the other man and his beliefs.

For these things violence can never be a substitute.

The Two Faces of the Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Arthur Krock which appeared in the Sunday, March 28, 1965, edition of the New York Times:

IN THE NATION: THE TWO FACES OF THE
OPPOSITION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the leader of the Senate minority, defined the classic role of the political opposition as an obligation to support the party in power when it is right and oppose it when wrong. A corollary of the formula is that the opposition should always seek first by thorough inspection to eliminate what it considers wrong in an otherwise constructive piece of legislation.

But DIRKSEN's immediate method of asserting the opposition's role toward the President's voting rights bill gives scant service to the corollary. And this has pointed up the dilemma in which the small Republican minority in Congress finds itself painfully involved.

The dilemma is: should their leaders join the responsible majority party in drafting legislation, especially measures whose objective has been a traditional Republican policy? Or should minority leaders await the final formulation by the majority before deciding what their party position is to be on the details of the draft? DIRKSEN, as leader of the Senate Republicans, grasped the first horn of this dilemma. The House minority leaders grasped the second.

OPPOSITION PARTICIPATION

DIRKSEN volunteered for the job of co-author of the President's voting rights bill, an offer which the administration was very pleased to accept. In so doing he assumed Republican coresponsibility with the President and with MIKE MANSFIELD, the Senate majority leader, for the bill as a whole.

Representative GERALD FORD, of Michigan, the House minority leaders, backed by such prominent Members of his rank and file as Representatives JOHN LINDSAY, of New York City, reserved the opposition function of trying to amend the text where his group might find this essential to the constitutional and practical attainment of the objective. The difference between these concepts of the required role of a constructive opposition is fundamental where a matter of domestic policy is concerned.

REPUBLICAN CORESPONSIBILITY

When congressional action proposed by the party in power involves war, or the presence of an emergency that could lead to war, the classic role of the opposition is to participate actively with the majority at all stages. The failure of Presidents F. D. Roosevelt and Truman to make a partner of the Republican minority in such situations evoked the famous complaint of Harold E. Stassen: "They come to us for counsel," he said, "not at the take-offs but after the crash landings." And seldom if ever has a titular minority leader committed his party, as DIRKSEN did, to the extent inherent in his status, to full partnership with the responsible majority in the drafting of major domestic legislation.

His reasons were substantial. But the price of minority leadership as DIRKSEN is exercising it is preclusion of the flexibility required by the opposition—in this instance

to broaden the scope of the administration measure and at the same time mesh its machinery more smoothly into the Constitution. By already retreating from support of one major provision of the President's bill that has the effect of flagrant discrimination among the States, DIRKSEN has tacitly acknowledged the value of a far more thorough inspection than he gave the text before he stamped it with the label of the official Senate Republican leadership. The major amendment he now will support is directed at an enforcement formula by which elections in four States—Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas—where the statistics of Negro voting denote discrimination are made immune from Federal supervision by reason of the fact that they impose no literacy test, though their voting percentages in November 1964, were below the 50 percent requirement of the bill for this immunity.

FORD'S STAND VALIDATED

It was on the sound presumption that revolutionary, legally controversial legislation drawn in such haste would develop fundamental flaws that Representative FORD, the House minority leader, declined the invitation from DIRKSEN and the Democratic leadership to introduce (and thereby sponsor) the administration text. He wanted to preserve flexibility to the House Republicans, and the time to make a sound evaluation of how and in what respects, this flexibility should be used to improve the legislation, from the minority standpoint. Ford finds sufficient evidence of the soundness of his position in DIRKSEN's rapid persuasion that the bill needs clarifying language to assure it will not protect, in four or more States, the discriminatory practices against Negro voting that it is precisely designed to forbid.

Such are the two concepts of Republican opposition. And thus far, with the President's measure in the committee hearings stage, and under heavy political pressure for rapid translation to a similar truncated examination by the whole congressional body, Ford's theory of the role and responsibility of an opposition has justified itself better than DIRKSEN's. Furthermore, he is initiating changes on which his party can lay claim to having made improvements in a text from which its Senate leader originally precluded himself by coauthorship.

Economic Assistance to Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been very much disturbed and uneasy over the situation in Vietnam, and about the possible escalation of the conflict in southeast Asia—both frightening threats to our goal of a peaceful world.

I was therefore tremendously encouraged and impressed by President Johnson's recent proposals for economic assistance to that region when peace has been restored; and I am hopeful that from this positive approach we may be able to effect a prompt and responsible solution to the problems which now face us in that area.

In addition, I was certainly heartened by the endorsement by the New York Times of such proposals, in its editorials of March 27 and March 28.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am taking the liberty of inserting these two editorials, which speak for themselves.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 27, 1965]

A VITAL STEP TOWARD PEACE

President Johnson has taken a major step forward by offering to help in wider and bolder programs of regional economic development in southeast Asia once peace is restored. In effect, he has begun to open the long-awaited diplomatic track with which some of his advisers had hoped the bombing of North Vietnam would be accompanied.

The President's statement, vague and guarded as it is, begins the vital process of defining the kind of settlement the United States is prepared to accept in Vietnam. Much more definition will be needed, along with concrete proposals for bringing about the honorable negotiation the President has just evoked as an objective. For each passing day makes it clearer that military measures alone will neither defeat the Communist guerrillas nor attract their political masters to the conference table.

The regional approach is essential. A settlement within the confines of Vietnam itself will be difficult to achieve. If compromises are to be found, they will be found only over a wider region that covers the four successor states of Indochina and, perhaps, much of southeast Asia.

A regional development plan that would enable southeast Asia to produce a huge rice surplus for North Vietnam and mainland China—both critically short of food—could not fail to play a positive part in peace discussions. The Communist effort to seize the rice-surplus areas of southeast Asia by war would appear less attractive once it became clear that vastly larger supplies could be obtained through peace.

Such a prospect exists in the United Nations plan for an international Mekong River development that would outshadow the Tennessee Valley Authority in size and scope. The urgent common interest that Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam have developed in this project has taken precedence over their ancient national rivalries.

Presumably this is the kind of project President Johnson has in mind. It can help lead the way not only to a settlement in Vietnam but to a stable peace in Asia. It is the route the United States failed to take in 1953 and 1954 when fighting was ended in Korea and Indochina.

From 1953 to 1964, the United States has plowed almost \$15 billion into military aid and defense support in the Far East, but less than \$1 billion into development loans and technical assistance. The armistice with Communist China and North Vietnam did not bring peace, in part because both sides were less interested in organizing cooperation than in pursuing the cold war. The opportunity that was missed a decade ago may be recovered again if the United States pushes forward now with imaginative proposals for Asian development which, at the same time, may help bring about the peace negotiations that will make development possible.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

SOMETHING MORE THAN BOMBS

The limited American air war against North Vietnam is now entering its eighth week. It is not too soon to ask what it has accomplished—and why it has not accomplished more.

The aim of the continuing air offensive, accompanied by threats of further escalation, was to persuade the North Vietnamese Communists to halt their armed infiltration into South Vietnam. When it was undertaken,

one of President Johnson's highest advisers predicted privately that the Communists' will to fight would be weakened in 2 months. So far, there is no indication that he was right; on the contrary, there clearly has been a stiffening of Communist positions, as Secretary Rusk has admitted.

The Soviet Union has announced that arms aid is on its way to North Vietnam. More important, a direct Soviet-American confrontation in southeast Asia through the use of Soviet volunteers in North Vietnam has been publicly threatened by the top Soviet leader, Communist Party First Secretary Brezhnev.

The Vietnamese and Chinese Communists have stiffened their positions even more. Hanoi, which a few weeks ago privately indicated agreement to French and United Nations proposals of negotiations—while refusing a cease-fire—now rejects such proposals. Backed by Moscow, the North Vietnamese insist that there can be no talks while American bombing continues. Peiping has taken the most extreme position of all. It insists there can be no negotiations before the complete, unconditional withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. The Vietcong, which shows some signs of independence from Hanoi, has enthusiastically adopted the Peiping line.

Meanwhile, the American bombing—not to mention use of nonlethal gas—has significantly alienated world opinion. Concern about the danger of a major war is widespread. Equally important, there is profound puzzlement about Washington's objectives and tactics.

The trouble is that President Johnson, a master of domestic politics, had until last week seemed to forget that war is politics too, even if pursued by other means. He launched a military offensive, but neglected his diplomatic offensive.

Now the President has promised American aid for wider and bolder programs of regional economic development benefiting all of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam. Despite its vague terms, this promise indicates that Washington is beginning to face up to the need to offer its opponents in southeast Asia a diplomatic, political and economic exit from the military cul-de-sac in which we as well as they are now entrapped.

Persuasive peace proposals can be a political weapon not only toward world opinion, at a time when Americans are bombing Asians, but in presenting moderate Communists with an alternative they can support within the Communist camp. That camp is divided, not only along national lines but within each national capital. And nowhere are the divisions more critical than in Hanoi.

Neither the Vietcong nor the Chinese Communists can be swayed by the bombing of North Vietnam, which causes them no direct pain. They are pressing to intensify the war. The Vietcong, particularly, has made major military gains in recent months and sees every successive Saigon coup as another nail in the coffin of its enemies. It will not be easy for Hanoi, in these circumstances, to shift course and seek a negotiated settlement, even with Soviet backing.

Military pressure alone—which implies a demand for unconditional surrender—is unlikely to swing the balance in the Hanoi leadership toward a negotiated settlement. Positive American proposals, which suggest a way out and a viable future for North Vietnam, are the essential complement.

President Johnson's statement last week could be the precursor of proposals offering Hanoi, once peace is restored, access to the rice of South Vietnam, trade with the West, an end of the embargo and diplomatic boycott that Washington and Saigon have imposed since 1954, and entry to international development assistance. Area development schemes covering the entire Mekong Valley could be pushed. These, linked with con-

crete proposals for negotiations and firm offers of a phased American withdrawal from South Vietnam in accordance with the Geneva agreements, could not fail to influence events.

An immediate Communist response might not be forthcoming. But the words would be heard both within the Communist regimes and outside. World opinion would be rallied. That support will be needed, especially if the war in Vietnam is about to enter a new and more virulent phase.

The 1967 Centennial of the Alaska Purchase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I hereby offer for the attention of my colleagues and others the second part of "An Event of National Significance," as depicted in the 1964 Annual Report of the Alaska Centennial Commission. I refer to the projected observances in Alaska in 1967 celebrating the 100th anniversary of Alaska's existence under the American flag.

The Commission is made up of 16 prominent Alaskans. They are Vernon Forbes, its chairman from Fairbanks; Mrs. Alice Harrigan, its vice chairman from Sitka; Claire O. Banks of Anchorage; William R. Cashen, of College; Jack Farnsworth, of Soldotna; Bill Feero, of Skagway; Mrs. Genevieve Harmon, of Juneau; Jack R. Peck, of Anchorage; Donald E. Perkins of Nome; Robert Powell, of Anchorage; Mrs. Doris Volzke of Ketchikan; Arthur F. Waldron, of Anchorage; Edward M. Wolden, of Anchorage; Frank P. Young of Fairbanks; George Sharrock, of Anchorage; and Mrs. Helen Irick, of Kodiak. Staff for the Commission consists of an executive director, Herb Adams, and a secretary, Mrs. Beverly Swanson.

This part concerns projects and programs of the Alaska Centennial Commission that aim at enhancing Alaska as a tourist destination, and with the task of carrying out other programs of commemoration:

AN EVENT OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE—PART 2 ENHANCING ALASKA AS A TOURIST DESTINATION

In its planning for 1967, the Alaska Centennial Commission is seeking not only to stage events that will attract attention and audiences in 1967, but also is seeking to enhance Alaska as a tourist destination in that year and years hence.

PERMANENT PROJECTS

Toward this objective, permanent centennial projects are being adopted by local centennial committees across the State. To qualify for 25-cent-per-capita grants, which were approved by the 1964 legislature, such projects must meet a community need, be commemorative of the centennial year, and have a reasonable prospect of completion by 1967. Such grants also must be matched by the local committee.

At the centennial exhibition site in Fairbanks a 40-acre exhibition of Alaska and Alaskan history is planned by 67 North, the

A1494

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 29, 1965

Fairbanks Centennial Committee. In part aided by centennial per capita grants, the exhibition will also be financed by city and private contributions. Among other attractions planned are the Riverboat Nenana, a building housing Huerlin paintings, and an Indian village.

In Anchorage, permanent centennial projects being planned are three geodesic-domed buildings and a monument to William Henry Seward. Projects being explored by groups other than the committee itself are an Alaskan animal zoo and a sports arena.

In Sitka, an authentic Russian tearoom is being established near the Ferry Terminal by the Sitka Centennial Committee. Reconstruction of a native fish camp of the 19th century is also planned.

Illustrations of other permanent centennial projects are restoration of two gold-rush buildings by the Skagway Centennial Committee, reconstruction of Fort Kenay by the Kenai Centennial Committee, construction of museums by the Homer Centennial Committee and by the Wrangell Centennial Committee, and establishment of an aquarium and forest products display by the Petersburg Centennial Committee.

Permanent centennial projects being explored include the construction of a replica of an early log church by the Gastineau Channel Centennial Committee, establishment of a salmonboat tourist attraction by the Ketchikan Centennial Committee, establishment of a library by the Metlakatla Centennial Committee, construction of an auditorium by the Sitka Centennial Committee, preservation of an aboriginal site by the Soldotna Centennial Committee, creation of a memorial to Vitus Bering and his voyage of discovery by the Cordova Centennial Committee, and purchase of museum cases for the library by the Kotzebue Centennial Committee.

In addition to adopting permanent projects for themselves, local committees and the State Commission are encouraging similar action by other organizations. An illustration is the Sitka Historical Society's fund-raising effort, endorsed by the Sitka Centennial Committee, to preserve the Russian mission, a registered national historic landmark. On the State level, the commission is inviting State societies and associations to give thought to projects they will sponsor as contributions to the centennial year.

HISTORIC SITES

Another important means of enhancing Alaska as a tourist destination is through erection of historical markers and placement of historical plaques. More than 80 highway markers are now in place, and this program of the department of highways is continuing. Fifty bronze plaques to identify sites and buildings important in the history of Alaska have been purchased and will be mounted on buildings such as the Elk's hall in Juneau (where the first elected legislature met) and at sites such as Kaslof (where the Russian colony of St. George was established). Sites and buildings important in the histories of communities will be marked by local centennial committees.

Interpretive markers are slated for erection in 1965 at Old Sitka and Castle Hill, both State-owned historic sites. Funding for physical improvements at the flag-raising site of Castle Hill is being sought by the commission.

At the same time the commission is proceeding to identify sites for marking, it is carrying out an inventory of sites now marked. With this information, two publications—a guide to historic sites in Alaska and a history map—will be issued in advance of 1967. Based upon these, history-land trails, growing in importance as tourist attractions, will be organized.

CIVIC IMPROVEMENT

Another means of enhancing Alaska as a tourist destination is the planned paint-up,

clean-up campaign that will be conducted across the State. Sponsorship of the project is being proposed to a number of statewide organizations.

LOCAL HISTORY

Local histories are being compiled by several centennial committees and they are being assisted by the commission. In some cases, this basic information will be utilized for a local history guide or map; in others it will be published as a community history.

Labor and business groups and associations of all kinds are being urged to mark centennial year by producing their histories. Being compiled by the Alaska Council of Churches to mark the centennial is a history of religious groups in Alaska.

SCHOOLS, CHURCHES

Schools are expected to participate by presenting Alaska, past and present, through assemblies and special programs. Together with churches, schools may participate in the organization of symposia for reflection upon culture and civilization in Alaska.

CARRYING OUT OTHER PROGRAMS OF COMMEMORATION

During 1967, pioneers—the builders of Alaska—will be honored in ceremonies. And, organizations are being urged to pay especial recognition to their members who have played significant roles in the public life of the State.

PUBLICATIONS

A series of monographs dealing with selected aspects of Alaska's history and people is being planned in conjunction with the University of Alaska. Aimed at making good accounts of important developments widely available, all titles in the series would be in similar format.

Issuance of publications by others is being encouraged by the Commission. Tentatively slated for publication by 1967 are: "Alaska History" and "Alaska Aboriginal Culture" (National Park Service), and "Geographic Dictionary of Alaska" (U.S. Board on Geographic Names).

A new biography of Seward (Oxford University Press), a new history of Russian-America (Viking), the story of the Alaska-based Russian attempt to gain Hawaii (University of California), and an account of 19th century American exploration of Alaska (Yale)—all scheduled for publication in advance of the centennial year, will call attention to the approach of the centennial.

MEDALS, STAMPS

The centennial of the purchase will be commemorated by bronze and silver medals bearing the centennial emblem on one side and, on the reverse, a profile of the man whose vision resulted in the purchase, William H. Seward. The medals will be sold by local centennial committees with all profits going toward their projects.

A commemorative postage stamp will also be issued. The U.S. Post Office Department is being urged to designate Sitka as the place for first-day issue.

Visitors to Alaska in 1967 will receive certificates noting the centennial, and they will be able to purchase privately produced souvenirs of much variety.

Progressive Growers' Association
SurveyEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Growers' Association in my con-

gressional district has just completed a survey of its membership of 700 farmers. This survey shows that a drastic curtailment of planted acreage in tomatoes, strawberries, miscellaneous vegetables, brussels sprouts, cucumbers, and beans will result if supplemental foreign labor is not available for California farmers. Obviously, this will create extreme hardship for the employees in canneries and other allied industries, many of whom are Mexican-Americans. It is ironic that certain propaganda groups are fighting the realism that crops simply will not be planted without supplemental labor and in so doing are hurting the minority groups they profess to be helping.

Below is a table showing the planting intentions of 700 farmers with or without supplemental foreign labor:

Crops	Acreage	1965 crop survey	
		With supplemental foreign labor	Without supplemental foreign labor
		Percent	Percent
Tomato.....	3,579	94.8	33.3
Strawberry.....	234½	66.2	25.7
Miscellaneous vegetables.....	674½	102.4	51.7
Brussel sprouts.....	1,218	99.7	35.3
Cucumbers.....	157	67.5	19.1
Beans.....	65	69.2	-----
Total, all crops....	5,928½	94.5	34.7

It should be pointed out that though the survey indicates that one-third the usual tomato acreage, 3,579, will be planted for a total of approximately 1,200 acres that these plants are predicted in 98 percent of the cases upon the possibility of harvesting by machine. Thus, jobs for human beings will be sacrificed in favor of the inferior quality which will result from machine picking. This, too, will have an adverse effect upon Mexican-Americans and other domestic workers.

The 47th Anniversary of the Byelorussian
Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, the courageous people of the formerly independent Byelorussian Democratic Republic marked the 47th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence. In the United States, a convention of Americans of Byelorussian descent was held on March 21, 1965, to commemorate this date. Although their former compatriots remain under the iron rule of Communist Russia, there is no doubt that the citizens of present-day Byelorussia joined silently, but forcefully, in this observance.

For the flame of freedom burns deep within the Byelorussian people. The successful effort at independence in 1918 was the culmination of many attempts

to secure for themselves a national identity over the years. But self-determination is a word that is not in the Communist lexicon, and this independence was shortlived. Despite this fact, the traditions, customs, and spirit of a Byelorussian nation continues on. The importance of this national group, and its ability to identify as a national group, is underscored by the fact that their Communist masters feel the need for a separate "puppet" state within the borders of the Soviet Union.

By marking the anniversary of the independence movement of these brave people, we expose the fiction of this puppet regime and encourage the legitimate aspirations of Byelorussians everywhere for self-determination in their homeland. Those of us who have the benefits of freedom can do no less than this.

Residual Oil Quotas Should Go

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1965, I addressed the House concerning the continuing problems imposed on New England by unfair residual oil quotas, see page 4613 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 10, 1965. As I pointed out, these quotas are extremely unfair to New England and indeed the entire eastern seaboard. Hopefully, they will soon be abolished by this administration which is doing so much for the coal mining regions of this country and the oil producing regions of this country, and so little for the consumer and so little for New England. It is encouraging to me that the message is getting through to the people in my district.

William Rotch, the editor and publisher of the Milford Cabinet, recently wrote a perceptive editorial on the subject. The Littleton Courier, whose editor Jack Colby has frequently spoken out against the injustices of the residual oil quota, has also commented perceptively on the subject.

Because even now the decision by this administration on residual oil quotas is pending, I insert these editorials in the RECORD in hopes that their message will be read by those charged with this important decision.

[From the Milford Cabinet & Wilton Journal, Mar. 25, 1965]

WHY GET EXCITED ABOUT RESIDUAL OIL?

Chances are that most people in New Hampshire have never seen any residual oil and would not recognize it if they did. Yet, in Washington their Congressman is urging the administration to lift quotas on the amount of residual oil that can be imported and charging that New England industries are bleeding to death in order to subsidize the coal interests of the Appalachian States.

The residual oil story would appear to shed some light on how politics can replace the laws of supply and demand, of how world trade can affect New Hampshire, and why it makes sense to have JIM CLEVELAND

stand up in Congress and make speeches calling for fewer restrictions on imported fuels. What is it all about?

The Cleveland version of the story is explained in the adjoining column. But a few days before we read his remarks we were chatting with an engineer for one of the big New York power companies. We asked him to explain in simple language the problem of residual oil and why we should get excited about it. This explanation may be oversimplified, but for what it is worth we pass it along.

In the United States petroleum is refined in huge technically sophisticated plants that break down the crude oil into a variety of products. In some countries, Venezuela for one, the refining process is not carried so far, and after the gasoline is extracted what remains is a heavy black substance known as residual oil and valuable principally as an industrial fuel. Most residual oil comes from these foreign refineries and the amount that can be imported into the United States is limited by quota.

"My company's plants are equipped to burn either residual oil or coal," our engineer friend explained. "The oil is much cheaper and we would prefer it, but we cannot get enough. The Government quotas bear no relation to our needs, or to the increasing demands for electricity.

"The result is," he went on, "that we burn more and more coal. This is nice for the coal companies, and perhaps it helps Appalachia, but never forget that the cost is passed right along to the consumer, and if the coal interests are being helped it is only at the expense of the people who use our electricity."

This explanation ties in with what JIM CLEVELAND has been saying in Washington. By limiting imports of residual oil the administration forces New England industries to use a more expensive fuel. Chances are the consumer never knows what is hitting him; he just knows that prices keep going up.

So we elect a Congressman to go down to Washington where we hope someone listens when he declares that New England is willing to pay its full share of the costs for the national welfare, but it deeply resents the constant and silent tribute it has to pay to the special interests of the coal-producing States.

[From the Littleton (N.H.) Courier, Mar. 18, 1965]

TRIBUTE TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

"We in New England are more than ready as we have always been, to pay our share of costs for the national welfare, but we deeply resent and deplore this silent exaction of tribute to special interests."

Making this statement on the floor of the House in Washington recently was Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, and reference was being made to restrictions of residual oil coming into New England. These controls on a fuel so basic to our economy "are slowly bleeding us" for the benefit of coal-producing areas, Congressman CLEVELAND charged.

The coal industry today is vigorous and healthy, with even brighter prospects ahead, and the residual oil quotas could be discarded completely without affecting the coal areas. Yet it is these areas, representing powerful economic and political blocs, that are responsible for the continued maintenance of the quotas that place a heavy financial burden on the consumer of fuel in New England—with no relation to the economic problem of our coal-producing areas.

"These same coal-producing areas have won a huge Federal subsidy in the form of the Appalachian bill," Congressman CLEVELAND pointed out. "Let me say that we in New England are most sympathetic with the economic problems of Appalachia. We, too, are part of the Appalachian chain and we know what it is like to lose whole industries

on which the economic life of our communities depends. We are fighting back and making a good fight. We do not ask the rest of the country for special favors. But we do ask for terms of fair competition.

"While our taxes will be taken to help finance this tremendous Appalachian program for 11 States, we are also paying additional tribute to the coal States in the form of high fuel costs, unnecessarily imposed through the discriminatory residual oil quota system.

"New Englanders are being asked to support the Appalachia program, yet at the same time we are being forced to endure hardship through the fuel policy imposed largely by the power of the Appalachian coal States."

As the Congressman points out, it is high time that controls on a fuel so basic to the New England economy be removed once and for all. There is no room for discrimination of this or any other kind.

Gas Warfare: A Switch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the current furore over gas warfare has a curious sidelight which could encourage distrust of official statements. This concerns the manner and timing of "revelations" that gas was used 2 years ago against villages in Yemen.

My special interest in this matter stems from the fact that first accounts of the Yemen incident came as a news scoop by a husband-wife foreign correspondent team, my friends Tom and Harle Dammann of San Diego, Calif.

That scoop, for which Mr. and Mrs. Dammann were nominated for a Pulitzer award, is referred to in the following editorial carried Thursday, March 25, in Chicago's American:

GAS WARFARE: A SWITCH

The worldwide reaction to the use of riot-control gases against Communist forces in Vietnam has up to now followed a highly predictable pattern. The United States is being bitterly denounced for allowing the use of gas in warfare—any gas, even the nonpoisonous types used against rioters in many countries—and the Communists are wringing all the propaganda value out of it they can, which is plenty.

A remarkable twist has been given the situation, however, by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—perhaps by accident, perhaps not. It indicates that Washington may have outsmarted itself, not for the first time, and is now taking the heat that should have been directed against President Nasser of the United Arab Republic.

Senator BURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa, senior Republican on the committee, late last week said he'd concluded that the United Arab Republic had been using gas warfare against villages in royalist-held territory of Yemen. This was not exactly news in itself. In June 1963, Chicago's American carried detailed reports from Saudi Arabia on the gas warfare charges made by the Imam Mohammed el-Badr, deposed King of Yemen. The stories were filed by our Middle East correspondents, Tom and Harle Dammann, who had checked them out with representatives of the International Red Cross and American and British military observers.

March 29, 1965

According to eyewitness reports passed along to the Dammanns, bombs that had fallen near the Imam's headquarters in Yemen had killed some victims and caused hemorrhaging or severe blistering in others. There were charges, unsubstantiated, that "radioactive weapons" had been used. The Red Cross was asked to investigate, and for a time Saudi Arabia planned to bring up the charges in the United Nations.

Subsequently, though, the story dropped out of the news. The official bodies concerned joined in damping it down, even though the reports of gas warfare never were disproved and seemed to have been confirmed all down the line.

Evidence is that the hush-up was the result of pressure from Washington. Whether it came from the White House, the State Department, or the Pentagon is not clear, but it appears that publicity for the poison-gas charges would have conflicted with the Kennedy administration's then-current policy of backing Nasser. It might, moreover, have endangered disarmament talks then going on with the Soviet Union, since there were hints that the gas bombs had been supplied by West Germany.

HICKENLOOPER's statement, coming so conveniently before the announcement that gas had been used in Vietnam, may indicate that the wraps are coming off, and we'll now hear a lot more about the Yemeni charges.

That, of course, would help direct world censure against Egypt and away from us. This kind of maneuvering may be "smart," but it's also repellent. The whole story indicates managed news is still current policy in Washington—that public opinion is still regarded as something to be turned on and off at will and directed where the government wants it. That belief needs to be fought, now and always.

Department of Agriculture's Opposition to Cargo Preference Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of the Cargo Preference Act, better known as the 50/50 Act, I was very much interested in an article in this morning's Baltimore Sun.

The purpose of the above-mentioned act is to assure that 50 percent of the shipments made under the AID program are shipped in U.S.-flag vessels when they are available. Several of the Government agencies do everything they can to avoid this law but the Department of Agriculture has been the greatest offender. This is borne out in the article which follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CALLED HOSTILE TO U.S. FLEET

New York, March 28.—The Department of Agriculture was charged today with displaying "overt hostility" toward the American-flag merchant marine.

The denunciation, directed primarily against Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, came from the Seafarers International Union.

Signed by Paul Hall, president of the SIU, the letter charged that the Department of Agriculture has consistently been hostile to the merchant marine "and that, while expending billions of dollars annually to support a small segment of our farm population,

has never missed an opportunity to wall loudly about the high cost of using American ships."

COPIES SENT OUT

The original letter was sent to Murphy. Copies were sent to all members of the Maritime Advisory Committee, which was created by Executive order of President Johnson last June to consider the problems of the American maritime industry.

Hall represents the SIU on that Committee. Copies of the letter were also sent to the chairmen of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, House Banking and Currency Committee, House Agriculture Committee, Senate Commerce Committee, and House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Hall's letter strongly criticized Murphy's recent testimony before the International Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

MURPHY IS QUOTED

On March 16, Hall said, Murphy told the subcommittee members, in essence, that the use of American-flag merchant ships is detrimental to the export of U.S. farm products to Russia and other Communist countries.

Murphy has also been severely criticized by the American Maritime Association and the American Tramp Shipowners Association. The two associations have assailed him for saying that America has lost wheat sales to Russia because of the Cargo Preference Act. The legislation assures that part of any U.S.-financed agricultural product sales be shipped by American vessels.

The letter sent by Hall noted that the amount spent by the Agriculture Department for farm subsidies is 12 times the amount spent for all programs of assistance to the merchant fleet, and that 3 subsidies paid on cotton alone cost American taxpayers \$800 million a year.

This figure is 10 times the annual cost of the entire cargo preference program, it added.

INTENTION CALLED CLEAR

"We have been told by representatives of the Department," Hall added, "that Agriculture has no wish to thwart the clearly expressed intention of Congress that this Nation shall have a strong merchant marine."

"Yet we are continuously being confronted with new evidence of Agriculture's antipathy toward the merchant marine. Certainly your attempt, before the International Finance Subcommittee, to again downgrade and devalue the role of our merchant marine, in our Nation's commerce, is a striking case in point."

The SIU president also noted that his union had detailed a series of specific charges against the Agriculture Department in a 40,000-word presentation to the Maritime Advisory Committee November 16. In the presentation, the union had called for the replacement of the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman.

"Although 4 months have elapsed," Hall continued, "Agriculture has not seen fit to respond to this document, but instead has continued to pursue the same policies which gave rise to the charges therein."

A Responsible Republican Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article

which appeared in the Friday, March 26, 1965, edition of the New York Times:

WASHINGTON: A RESPONSIBLE REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 25.—The Republicans in Congress are proving to be a constructive opposition. They are working against overwhelming odds—32 to 68 in the Senate, 140 to 294 in the House—but they have maintained a sense of purpose and even a sense of humor.

This is not an easy exercise. When a party has been overwhelmed at the polls, as the Republicans were in 1932 and again in 1964, the task of reconstruction seems almost hopeless. Its leaders are scattered, its numbers reduced in the Congress, its power undermined in the States, its organization disrupted and its party workers demoralized.

Yet the Republican, though they have been out of power for 24 of the last 32 years, are not acting like a bitter or obstructionist minority. They are supporting President Johnson's foreign and domestic programs when they think he is right and trying to put forward constructive alternatives when they think he's wrong.

THE VOTING RECORD

The voting rights bill is a dramatic illustration of the point. The Republican leader in the Senate, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, not only worked with Attorney General Katzenbach in drafting the bill, but is now helping guide it through the Judiciary Committee against the opposition of the southern Democrats.

The Republican leader in the House, GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, along with Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, and other Republicans, are leading a campaign to strengthen the voting rights bill and extend its provisions to many thousands of deprived Negroes not covered by the administration's proposals.

There is no evidence that the Republican Party stands to gain, at least in the short run, by a vast increase in Negro voting. On the contrary, all indications are that the new Negro voters will side overwhelmingly with the Democratic Party, and could even help win back for the Democrats in the 1968 presidential election the Southern States won by the Republican last year.

Yet the Republican leaders in this Congress are quite consciously trying to remove the charge leveled against the party in the Goldwater campaign—that it sought to win by appealing to the anti-Negro elements in both the North and the South.

THE VIETNAM RECORD

The controversy over policy in Vietnam also illustrates the constructive attitude of the Republicans in Congress. The Democrats are highly vulnerable to political attack for their record in that peninsula. They underestimated the power of the North Vietnamese, and helped destroy what little political unity existed under the Diem regime in South Vietnam.

It is quite fair to say, as the Democrats constantly do, that they are merely carrying on in that country the policy started by the Republicans under President Eisenhower. They have changed the whole character of the war in the last 3 years, yet the Republicans have supported the President more consistently than some of the leaders of his own party.

Seldom in the history of the Nation have the Executive and the Congress managed to find a working arrangement in which the President had adequate power and the legislature had adequate control, and this is certainly not the case now.

The administration has the votes and the political skill to work its will on the home front—even on such controversial issues as